

\$2.25



the
DEAD SEA
SCROLLS
and the
EARLY CHURCH

LUCETTA MOWRY

NDP 54

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS
and the EARLY CHURCH

Today the impact of the Qumran community on the early Christian Church has become a matter of vital concern for the teacher of New Testament literature.

In assessing the similarities between the Qumran and early Christian communities, Miss Mowry examines the theme of redemption, one that is central to the two literatures. In this context she studies the messianic figures common to both sects, the idea of afterlife, and the ceremonial rites of the Qumran. This well-balanced comparison of the two communities is a substantial contribution to the general appraisal value of the scrolls.

Lucetta Mowry holds a B.D. from Yale Divinity School and a Ph.D. from Yale University. She is a professor in the Department of Biblical History, Wellesley College.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME PRESS

The Dead Sea Scrolls
and the
Early Church

The Dead Sea Scrolls
and the
Early Church

BY LUCETTA MOWRY

University of Notre Dame Press
Notre Dame & London

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 62-12637

First paperback edition, 1966

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME PRESS
NOTRE DAME, INDIANA

© 1962 by The University of Chicago.
All rights reserved.

Manufactured in the United States of America

To my mother and father
with gratitude
and love

Preface

Today no responsible interpreter of the life and thought of the Church during the New Testament period can afford to neglect the material provided by the Dead Sea Scrolls. This book is an indication of my concern with that material as a teacher in the field of biblical history and interpretation. Its purpose is to provide those who teach and those who study the New Testament at the college level with a broad, general statement about the relation between the Dead Sea community and the early Christian Church.

As I have attempted to set forth my views I have become more and more aware of the inadequacies of my effort. Together with others who depend upon the published sources, I cannot calculate the increment to our knowledge that will eventually come from the fragments of Dead Sea manuscripts of many kinds that still repose unpublished in the Palestine Archeological Museum at Jerusalem, Jordan. Only those who are preparing these fragments for publication have that advantage, and we all hope that their work of publication will be speeded. Furthermore, to contain this study within reasonable bounds it was necessary to place limits upon the discussion of controversial issues and to keep to the central problem, leaving aside many things important in their own right but not essential to the purpose immediately in hand. But I venture to hope that those for whom this book is primarily intended will find it valuable as a systematic statement of one reaction to the material at the present state of our knowledge of it and as a point of departure for the discussion and for the further clarification of their own opinions. Indeed, the book may have some value also for the interested layman who, like the college student, may need to have the material put into the not always obvious context of the critical understanding of ancient Christian thought and institutions.

PREFACE

My indebtedness is manifold. I would like to express my thanks to Carl H. Kraeling, who first suggested that I undertake this study and who has been kind enough to see the book through the press during my absence from the United States; to Erwin R. Goodenough, who has urged me to persevere in the work; to my colleagues at Wellesley, past and present, who have broadened my perspectives and have helped clarify detail; and to friends and associates at Cambridge and in the Society of Biblical Literature. I am grateful also to the members of the Committee on Faculty Publications of Wellesley College and to the chairman of the Committee, Dean Ella Keats Whiting, who have supported my endeavor and have recommended that financial assistance be given to the printing of my manuscript. Miss Alice Johnson was of great help to me in shaping the manuscript during the earlier stages of its composition. But I must mention, finally, the inspiration provided by my own students at Wellesley, particularly in the New Testament seminars, where the questions at issue have been freely and roundly discussed and where I have had occasion to learn for myself the truth of the old maxim, *docendo discitur*. It is because my presentation has developed from such discussions that I trust it may be of interest to others who teach and study in the same field at the same level.

MADRAS, INDIA

November 1961

Abbreviations

Journals

BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
PEQ	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

Dead Sea Scrolls

Dam. Doc.	<i>The Damascus Document</i>
DSD	<i>The Manual of Discipline</i>
DSH	<i>The Habakkuk Commentary</i>
DST	<i>The Thanksgiving Psalms</i>
DSW	<i>The War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness</i>

Contents

Introduction	1
1. Two Literatures of Redemption	7
2. The Nature of the Two Communities	37
3. The Leaders of the Communities	61
4. The Founders of the Communities	78
5. The Search for Redemption within the Hebraic Tradition	93
6. Eschatological Beliefs and Their Basis	129
7. Hope in the Redemptive Work of the Messiah	155
8. Moral Responsibility and the Hope of Redemption	174
9. Acts of Devotion	205
Index to Passages Cited	249
General Index	254

Introduction

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and fragments of manuscripts in the caves of the jagged cliffs rising behind Khirbet Qumran has created more excitement in the field of biblical scholarship than any other archeological find of the century. Biblical scholars at the Hebrew University and the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem who first saw the manuscripts during the winter of 1947 and the early spring of 1948 sensed their value and with remarkable speed made the texts available for all who could work with Semitic languages. From 1948 on, many others realized that in this newly discovered material lie clues which, if correctly observed and related to known facts, might give the answers to problems formerly regarded as insoluble and unyielding. Tenaciously, they continue to search out the significance of these clues.

Scholarly controversies and debates followed the publication of the texts and concerned the dating of the Scrolls, the identification of the religious community which produced them, and the community's relationship to other religious movements in Palestine, particularly to the early developments within Christianity. Through discussion and debate the majority of scholars have been able to agree on certain issues. The community which produced the Scrolls existed from about the middle of the second century B.C. to A.D. 68 or 69 and is probably to be regarded as a separatist group within the larger Essene movement. Millar Burrows in his book on the Dead Sea Scrolls has presented the evidence for both conclusions so clearly and effectively that neither the period of the community's existence nor the identification of the group continues to be a matter of serious discussion.¹

¹ For Millar Burrows' discussion, see *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York, 1955), pp. 73-298. Among the many scholars who agree with this position are John

The relation of this religious community to the early Church, and of the Scrolls to the documents of the New Testament, is still a controversial issue and probably will remain so for many years. Representative of one extreme of opinion is A. Dupont-Sommer, whose suggestions were widely circulated by Edmund Wilson in his popular presentations of the Scrolls and their significance. In contrast is Millar Burrows, whose caution and restraint have served as a check upon wild speculation.²

In 1950, Dupont-Sommer presented a paper before the French Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres in which he suggested that the founder of the Qumran Sect was in every important respect the prototype of Jesus. The Qumran founder had begun his career as a prophet and was martyred by official religious leaders of Jerusalem for reasons comparable to those causing Jesus' crucifixion. After the founder's death he appeared in glory to his followers, who from that time on awaited his return so that they might be vindicated and their persecutors condemned to eternal punishment. Acceptance of these suggestions led Edmund Wilson to conclude that the cradle of Christianity is not Bethlehem but the monastic settlement of the men who produced the Scrolls. Thus Christianity is freed from the shackles of "dogma and divine revelation" which surround the

Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Penguin Books, 1956), pp. 94-100; F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (New York, 1958), pp. 80-119; and K. Schubert, *Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer* (Basel, 1958), trans. John W. Doberstein as *The Dead Sea Community* (New York, 1959), pp. 36-41.

² Of the earlier articles written by Dupont-Sommer, the one which created the greatest excitement was probably "Le Maître de Justice fut-il mis à mort?" *VT*, I (1951), 200-215. His suggestion that the Teacher of Righteousness had suffered, died, and reappeared in glory to his followers and to the Wicked Priest aroused the interest of Edmund Wilson. Dupont-Sommer has apparently modified this earlier view; see *Les Écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* (Paris, 1959), pp. 369-79. Edmund Wilson's discussion appeared first as an article in the *New Yorker*, "The Scrolls from the Dead Sea," May, 1955, pp. 45-131, and later, revised and enlarged, in book form (New York, 1955). This publication evoked blatantly extravagant and irresponsible works, of which *The Lost Years of Jesus Revealed* by Charles Potter (Greenwich, Conn., 1959) is an example.

account of Christian origins. Wilson also stated that Christian scholars were afraid to work on the Scrolls because such an investigation would force them to conclude that Christianity is merely "an episode of human history." The discovery of the Scrolls puts the Christian movement in proper perspective, for the Church was not a contributor of unique ideas in the history of religious life and thought in the Western world but an organization which was successful in its triumph over the vicissitudes of history. Arguments against the statements of Dupont-Sommer which Wilson used as the basis for his conclusions have already been published and need not be reviewed here. The impact of the suggestions was, and still is, so great that his views will be discussed in chapter iv, which considers the importance of the founders in the life of the Sect and the early Church. There is, however, one very serious fallacy in Wilson's argument which can be mentioned here. Acceptance of Dupont-Sommer's "messianic" interpretation of the Qumran founder's significance does not lead to the conclusion that "dogma and divine revelation" no longer envelop Christian origins. The removal of the Christian "cradle" from Bethlehem to the Sectaries' monastery does not make the origin of Christianity a mere episode of human history but leaves it an episode of the history of a particular people, the Jews, whose tradition was also "propagated as dogma and divine revelation." As Krister Stendahl in his comments on Wilson's point of view has stated, professional scholars have long recognized the tension between this episode and the dogmatic claims of the Church and have dealt with it as a complex problem for which they have no ready and crystal-clear solution.³

Millar Burrows represents a position contrary to that of Dupont-Sommer and of Edmund Wilson, not because he wishes to defend Christianity with its "dogma and divine revelation," but because his study of the Scrolls for a period of seven years convinced him that the meaning of the New Testament has not been changed or significantly clarified by the discovery. Since he was one of the first scholars to recognize the importance of the Scrolls and has con-

³ K. Stendahl, "The Scrolls and the New Testament: An Introduction and a Perspective," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl (New York, 1957), p. 4.

tributed by his studies to an understanding of their significance, his judgment must be considered seriously. While he agrees with other scholars that parallels can be found between the Scrolls and the documents of the New Testament, he cannot regard these parallels as sufficient to prove direct Qumran influence upon the authors of New Testament documents. Since a comparison of Qumran and Christian ideas and practices indicates that the dissimilarities far outweigh the similarities between the two religious groups, Burrows accounts for the similarities as parallel but unrelated developments of a common religious heritage. Consequently, Burrows is inclined to regard as imaginative every attempt to find traces of an impact made by the Qumran community upon the early Church.

The collection of essays edited by Krister Stendahl represents a third point of view, one adopted by many scholars in the field. In general this group notes and discusses a variety of unusual coincidences between the Scrolls and the New Testament evidence on points such as the use of the terms *flesh* and *spirit* or the celebration of a sacred meal, believes that the Scrolls do furnish evidence for a religious outlook whose study will be important for a clearer understanding of early Christianity, and finds Dupont-Sommer's more radical conclusions untenable, while regarding those of Burrows as overly conservative. Gaster's use of two metaphors to describe the significance of the Scrolls for New Testament studies expresses vividly the point of view of this third group. He speaks of the Scrolls as providing "what may best be described as the backdrop of the stage on which the first act of the Christian drama was performed" and as "the seedbed of the New Testament."⁴ His use of the two metaphors is a rejection of Wilson's idea of the cradle and of Burrows' suggestion of parallel but probably unrelated developments.

Of course there is still much disagreement concerning the interpretation of detail and criticism from within and without. Thus, Karl Kuhn finds the similarities between the sacred meal of the Qumran community and the Lord's Supper significant, but Gaster

⁴ T. H. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (New York, 1956), pp. 2, 12.

does not.⁵ Sherman Johnson is inclined to regard the organization of the Jerusalem church under the leadership of the twelve disciples, with special mention of James, the brother of Jesus, and Peter and John, as reminiscent of the Qumran council of fifteen leaders, but Bo Reicke is not greatly impressed by the comparison.⁶ Criticism from without may be illustrated by the remarks of Philip Hyatt in his presidential address to the Society of Biblical Literature to the effect that "New Testament scholars and specialists in early Church history . . . have not made the most of the opportunities presented by the Dead Sea discoveries."⁷ Except as a device for encouraging still greater activity, these remarks are perhaps less judicious than the comment of David Noel Freedman in his review of Stendahl's publication, where he says of the articles contained in it, "the articles are a down payment on the larger books to come."⁸

Before comprehensive studies of the relationship between the Qumran and early Christian communities could be made, preliminary studies on special problems had to be undertaken. It is apparent, nonetheless, that the remarkably rapid publication of the texts and their clarification by experts have made it possible and, indeed, imperative for New Testament scholars to set forth comparative studies of greater scope. Stendahl, in his introductory article to the anthology he has compiled, gives a very sound directive to those studying the relation between the Qumran Sect and the early Church. The problem of understanding the two communities is not merely to check the similarities and dissimilarities of specific details of the life, thought, and activities of the two groups but more especially to find a fundamental outlook, common to both groups,

⁵ See Kuhn's article, "The Lord's Supper and the Common Meal at Qumran," in Stendahl's *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, pp. 65-93, and Gaster, *op. cit.*, pp. 278-29.

⁶ See Johnson's article, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts," and Reicke's article, "The Constitution of the Primitive Church in the Light of Jewish Documents," in Stendahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 133-34, 143-56.

⁷ "The Dead Sea Discoveries: Retrospect and Challenge," *JBL*, LXXVI (1957), 7.

⁸ "The Scrolls and the New Testament," *JBL*, LXXVIII (1959), 326.

through which the basic nature and purpose of the two communities may be studied and compared. He has suggested that the eschatological views of the communities are appropriate to such an endeavor. Clearly, any attempt to work out this sort of comparison must juxtapose the significant features of the total life and thought of one community to those of the other. The attempt need not claim, and cannot claim at this early date, to be definitive. A definitive work on any aspect of the Scrolls must be delayed as long as many of the fragments of the manuscripts discovered in the Qumran caves remain unpublished. Justification for a comprehensive study of the relationship between the Sectaries and the early Church at the present time lies in testing the evidence.

The point of view from which we will examine these two communities is that of salvation. There are two reasons for this choice. First, as one historian of religion has claimed, the "essence of a religion is to be a way of salvation." Second, as he has again pointed out, "religions differ most essentially as their conceptions of salvation differ."⁹ To apply this basic theme in a study of the two communities would, therefore, be a true test of the extent of the Sectaries' impact upon early Christian authors. The development of the discussion proceeds along the following lines. The first chapter deals with the literatures of the two communities as sources for our knowledge of their interest in salvation. Since the records are the product of communities, the task of chapter ii is to set out the nature of the two communities, especially as their natures may be illuminated by the theme of redemption. Chapters iii and iv consider the leaders and founders of the communities. They are discussed at this point because we can know them only through the medium of the communities they created. The discussion of the importance of redemption in the thought and devotional life of the Sect and the early Church takes up chapters v-ix.

⁹ W. L. King has expressed this view in *Introduction to Religion* (New York, 1954), p. 228. As a historian of various religious ways of salvation, King has presented an excellent discussion of the importance of this theme for all religions (pp. 227-356).

CHAPTER ONE

Two Literatures of Redemption

The literatures produced by communities who have wrestled with the riddles of human existence stand as monuments of their endeavors to explain the significance of life in terms of man's relation to the world, to society, and to God. Within the community of Israel the author or authors of the earliest source contained within the Pentateuch, designated as the J document, and the great eighth-century prophets first charted the course of its developing tradition. The author of the J document maintained that Yahweh, the God of Israel, had chosen Israel as his particular nation and had bound himself to it by ties of a covenanted promise. Proof of his steadfast love for it was to be found in Israel's history. Yahweh had delivered the patriarchs and Moses from famine and from the threatening absorption into other nations and had assured them of continuous existence as his chosen people. As the eighth-century prophets reflected upon the significance of Israel's election, they stressed its responsibilities. God's redemption was available, but Israel was not to presume upon it. Such was the beginning of the first literature of redemption, a redemption originally understood as deliverance from the oppression of neighboring peoples and from the folly of idolatry and later given both cosmic and individual overtones.

During the period between about 150 B.C. and A.D. 125 several religious groups within the common tradition of this literature and this faith attempted to interpret its meaning for their day and generation. Those best known to us as the creators of separate literatures of redemption are the group known in traditional sources as the

Essenes, and identified more or less closely with the Qumran Sectaries, and the early Christian Church.¹

It is interesting to note how the Essenes impressed their contemporaries, Pliny, Philo, and Josephus.² Pliny's comments upon the Essenes' type of monasticism stress their pessimistic reaction to the effort of living in a world whose uncontrollable forces bring sudden reversals in men's fortunes. Wearied by the struggle against such forces, many of the Essenes sought refuge in the silence of the desert cliffs rising above the shores of the Dead Sea. Philo and Josephus emphasize more positive reasons for the retreat from life. Philo praises the Essenes as the most notable "athletes of virtue" ever known in the history of the world and as men who have best understood how to love God, virtue, and their fellow men. Josephus points out that their monastic life gave them the discipline necessary to resist and to endure the barbarous persecutions of the Romans. Both Jewish authors, more sympathetic toward the Essenes than was Pliny, comment on the fact that the discipline of the Essenes arose from a study of the Hebraic tradition. Josephus and Philo imply that mo-

¹ The question how properly to relate the Qumran Sectaries and the Jewish sects of the traditional sources has been much discussed. Some scholars have identified the group with the Sadducees (e.g., R. North, "The Qumran 'Sadducees,'" *CBQ*, XVII [1955], esp. pp. 164-88), others with the Pharisees (e.g., C. Rabin, *Qumran Studies* [London, 1957], esp. pp. 37-52); and still others with the Ebionites (e.g., J. L. Teicher, "The Dead Sea Scrolls, Documents of the Jewish-Christian Sect of Ebionites," *JJS*, II [1951], 67-99). While opinions will continue to differ, it would seem to be the prevailing judgment of scholars today that the Qumran Sectaries are more closely related to the traditional Essenes than to any other group. See now W. H. Brownlee, "A Comparison of the Covenanters of the Dead Sea Scrolls with Pre-Christian Jewish Sects," *BA*, XIII (1950); T. H. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (New York, 1956), pp. vii-viii; F. M. Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (New York, 1958), pp. 37-38; Millar Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York, 1958), pp. 253-74, and *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York, 1955), pp. 227-28, 298; and finally R. de Vaux, "Les Manuscrits de Qumrân et l'Archéologie," *RB*, LVI (1959), 87-110. As Burrows has seen, there is some danger in speaking about the Qumran group as a "sect," due to the overtones of "heresy" which the term has developed in Christian usage.

² See Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* V, 17; Philo, *On the Freedom of the Virtuous Man* 12-13; Josephus, *War* II, 8, 2-12.

nasticism afforded the Essenes the opportunity to find redemption through super-observantism. Thus they were able to carry the insight of the earlier priestly writers of the Old Testament and of the later Pharisees to its ultimate, logical end. Removal from the corruptions of the world and intense concentration upon purity of life would gain them salvation.

Prior to the discovery of the Scrolls, information about the Essenes was limited to these few references. The discovery has added new dimensions to our understanding of this Jewish community and has made possible the association of certain previously published non-canonical documents of the intertestamental period with this group. The new material has created significant revolutionary changes in the assessment of the role played by this particular sect during the dramatic years between the Maccabean rebellion and the Roman victory over the Jews. The literature includes documents of various kinds.³ They are biblical documents, various types of re-worked biblical material, apocalypses, handbooks or manuals, and devotional works.

Archeologists have discovered at Qumran in their entirety or in fragmentary form all of the Old Testament documents with the exception of the Book of Esther. During the centuries prior to the canonization of the entire Old Testament (*ca.* A.D. 90), the

³ Since English translations of the Scrolls and of fragments of scrolls and résumés of their content have been published, the Qumran material is familiar and available to the reader. The first English translation of the Scrolls was that of Burrows in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 349–415. Translations of additional material discovered appeared in his second book, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 387–404. Attention is called to his useful list of non-biblical manuscripts of Qumran (pp. 407–9) in the latter work. Burrows' translation will be used throughout this book unless otherwise indicated; cf. Gaster's translation in *The Dead Sea Scriptures*. Scholars working on the vast accumulation of unpublished fragments are making the results of their research available in various scholarly journals. Obviously, reading the texts themselves is better than reading résumés of the material. Such résumés are available, however, especially in *The Excavations at Qumran* by J. van der Ploeg (London, 1958), pp. 151–84, and in *The Message of the Scrolls* by Y. Yadin (New York, 1957), pp. 90–159. In this connection, J. Allegro's *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York, 1958) might be mentioned because of the vivid portrayal, through photographs and brief description, of the Qumran monastery.

Qumran Sect not only accepted the Pentateuch as the final and authoritative revelation to Moses and the collection of prophetic writings as inspired and sacred documents but also recognized the more recently produced documents, "The Writings," as significant expressions of Israel's developing tradition. Like the Pharisees the community of Sectaries showed a willingness to maintain an open and elastic attitude toward the more recent expressions of Israel's faith. The preservation of biblical texts in the Qumran library, constant study of the sacred documents, and the predominant use of biblical language in the literature of the Sectaries testify to their dedication to the canonical works of the Bible. They had become bone of the Sect's bone and flesh of its flesh. The canon, as it was emerging in its final form in Palestine, was a source of inspiration. The Hebraic tradition itself had claimed that it would not be "far off" nor "too hard" for those who revered it. It was not in heaven or beyond the sea but very near them, even in their mouths and in their hearts (Deut. 30:11-14).

The Sect's veneration of the tradition and of its literature is not difficult to understand. The sacred literature was a record of God's revelation of himself and his activity in the lives of men generally and in the lives of his chosen people particularly. As such it was something miraculous, a part of the overpowering spectacle of the supernatural Being conveying knowledge of his will to men and of his desire to grant them salvation. Interestingly, the Old Testament documents which the Sect copied in greatest numbers were Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and the Book of Psalms.⁴ In these works the Sect found the traditional requirements for salvation (Deuteronomy), the prophecy of a glorious future (Isaiah), and the assurance of redemption experienced by individuals (Psalms).

Although the members of the Qumran Sect regarded this authoritative and sacred literature as the word of God, they considered it not the last and final word but the "seminal word." To supplement the authority found in the canonical writings, the members of the community created an extensive literature based upon traditional materials and including a wide range of forms, from commentaries upon biblical texts to legends about the patriarchs.

⁴ See Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, p. 34.

The biblical commentaries include works on Habakkuk, Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Isaiah, Hosea, the Psalms, and Genesis. In these documents the authors interpret prophetic oracles in the light of events of their age. For the present study the chief importance of the commentaries lies in the exegetical procedure used by the Sect to interpret Old Testament documents. Its hermeneutical method is of great significance for an understanding of that used in the literature of the early Church and will be more fully discussed in chapter iv.

Also inspired by Old Testament documents are the Sect's legendary paraphrases of traditional materials. Of the latter material two writings remain, the Genesis Apocryphon and the Speeches of Moses. Fragments of the book of Jubilees and the Testaments of Levi and of Naphtali have also been found in the Qumran caves. Thus it is probable, though not certain, that these documents, too, may have had their origin in the Qumran Sect. In any case, points of view expressed in these works are similar to the Sectaries' legendary paraphrases of traditional material.

In this type of literature the Qumran authors, following the precedent set by the Chronicler, altered the stories of the Pentateuch by pious and frequently fanciful embellishments. A more serious purpose of alteration was the attempt to use the stories as authoritative expressions of the tenets of the Sect. The compiler of the words of Moses' farewell address, for example, has copied the biblical text rather slavishly, but he has also added a legendary element in the climactic section of the collected sayings. By claiming that the Day of Atonement marked the end of Israel's wandering in the wilderness and the beginning of a new life in the land of promise, the author of the collection has heightened the importance of the festival for the Sect. The Sectaries' use of Scripture in these documents takes a form quite different from their interpretative expositions of prophetic documents. The hidden truth of sacred Scripture is here explained by rewriting familiar events of Israel's history and by inserting legendary details to make the Law of Moses correspond with Qumran thought. These documents, together with the commentaries, testify to the Sect's interest in supplementing biblical authority by adapting canonical works to its own purposes. The community desired in particular to prove that its members were the

true heirs of Israel's tradition and that the promises of redemption revealed by God to the patriarchs and to Moses now belonged to their brotherhood.

The Sectaries expressed their eschatological views, already evident in their commentaries and legendary paraphrases, in a third category of literature. In their apocalyptic writings, the War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness and the Apocalypse of the New Jerusalem, the authors have created an imaginative description of the battle prior to the final triumph of God and a picture of the New Jerusalem with its new and purified Temple. Ancient prophecies inspired these visions, but traditional writings were less the controlling factor here than in the two former categories of documents. Oracles found in Ezekiel 38 and 39 and in Zechariah 14:3-5 about the war between God's heavenly battalions and the armies hostile to Israel are a possible biblical source for the elaborate forty-year war described in the War Scroll.⁵ Here, as in apocalyptic works generally, the author creates his vision from the complex combination of biblical materials, current data, and his own fantasies. Likewise, the brief Apocalypse of the New Jerusalem probably has its biblical foundation in Isaiah's prophecy about a new heaven and a new earth. Included among apocalyptic documents in the Qumran library are pseudepigraphical works: Enoch, apparently extremely popular among the Sectarians; Noah; and Daniel, which had not as yet received canonical status. These apocalyptic visions were not merely the bizarre dreams of a few imaginative eschatologists. Fundamentally they expressed the Sectaries' hope and trust in God's power to rescue his people. If the final war threatened death in battle, they were, nevertheless, prepared to fight to the finish. The outcome would be worth the effort, for evil, darkness, and perversity would finally give way to a new world of righteousness, peace, and truth. Furthermore, since the enemy would fall and be devoured

⁵ It seems likely that the forty-year duration of the war mentioned in the War Scroll should be associated with the references to forty years found in the Damascus Document and the Commentary on Psalm 37. In the Damascus Document the time between the death of the Teacher of Righteousness and the inauguration of the Messianic Age is forty years. In the Commentary on Psalm 37 the wicked will be destroyed at the end of forty years.

not by the sword of man but by the power of God, victory was assured.

Preparation of the Sect for entry into the new age required a discipline and therefore gave rise to handbooks that clearly defined the rules of the order. Since the Hebraic tradition had in all circumstances stressed the nation's obedience to God, the Qumran Sect found the forms for expressing the essential elements of the discipline already fixed. Both the prophets with their herald-like proclamations and the Pentateuchal authors with their rehearsal of God's operation in concrete historical situations declared that the discipline must be derived from a clear understanding of God's nature and will. Following these precedents, Qumran authors included the didactic and hortatory features of the tradition in their handbooks.

The author of the handbook known as the Damascus Document heightened the importance of the Sect's regulations by using the historical approach to the question of attaining redemption. He prefaced the code of laws by a lengthy yet skilfully narrated account of the events which in the past had brought about the separation of a loyal remnant from the wicked and rebellious masses. Thus the author was able to contrast two groups sharply. On the one hand there had been generations of unregenerate Jews who had prided themselves on their own godless achievements and who had received their just deserts. On the other hand there had been such men as Noah, Abraham, and Moses who were counted as friends of God because they had not chosen to follow the will of their own spirits and had kept the commandments of God. These men had saved themselves and the men of their generation by their righteousness. A second handbook, the Manual of Discipline, includes a lengthy discussion similarly concerning the two instincts inherent in man's nature. These two forces control and explain his actions. By narrative, then, in the Damascus Document and by doctrinal instruction in the Manual of Discipline, the handbooks presented words of warning and encouragement to men who were honestly struggling to find the path of salvation and escape from the road leading to destruction. The signposts along the way were the laws themselves, which, if followed to the letter, guaranteed redemption.

By setting the consequences of man's response to God's commands

within the dominant theme of cosmic disaster rather than of national tragedy, the Qumran observantists intensified the necessity of obedience to God's will. The eternal consequences of present decisions and actions are expressed in the following quotation from the Damascus Document:

But all who hold fast to these ordinances, going out and coming in according to the law, and who listen to the voice of a teacher and confess before God, "We have sinned, we have done wickedly, both we and our fathers, in walking contrary to the statutes of the covenant; right and true are thy judgments against us"; all who do not lift a hand against his holy statutes and his righteous judgments and his true testimonis; who are instructed in the former judgments with which the men of the community were judged; who give ear to the voice of a teacher of righteousness and do not reject the statutes of righteousness when they hear them—they shall rejoice and be glad, and their hearts shall be strong, and they shall see his salvation, because they have taken refuge in his holy name.⁶

This fourth category of Qumran literature, therefore, gives some indication of the Sectaries' heroic effort to live according to the standards of God's laws for his people. By obeying the instructions of the community, the members of the Sect hoped to attain a perfection of righteousness and holiness never realized in the history of the nation and thereby to win with God's help the rewards of eternal life, glory, and peace.

In the Psalms of Thanksgiving, a fifth category of Qumran compositions, one senses the mystic's search for words to describe his longing for and assurance of redemption. Metaphors abound in these hymns, for the mystic was attempting to reveal the intensity of an emotion too deep for exact definition. His life is compared to a ship floundering in a storm-tossed sea, or he is endangered by the traps of crafty hunters or by lions who have whetted their tongues like a sword. He feels distressed, like a woman in travail bringing forth her first-born. When illuminated by God's perfect

⁶ Damascus Documents, MS. B 20:27-34 (Burrows' translation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 357-58). All quotations from *The Dead Sea Scrolls* are used with the permission of the Viking Press, Inc.

light and inspired by his creative spirit, he feels a sense of joy and release, as though he had been snatched from the pit and placed upon a high plain where he could walk erect in the light of God's forgiving love and with the hope of eternal redemption. Having seen the dazzling glory of God's presence, he asks the question, "What is man?" Man is a vain and empty creature molded of clay and kneaded with water, whose righteousness, though it exceed the righteousness of other men, cannot be compared with God's righteousness. Though the mystic endured the crucible of suffering and passed through the fires of doubt and despair, his previous experience of God's love led him to believe that he would find peace in turmoil, joy in sorrow, and new life in pain. The purpose of his present trials was to reveal God's strength in his own weakness and God's power to redeem the repentant. The psalmist's enemies were crafty men, deceitful garblers of truth, and even his friends had become defamers of his name. To those suffering from the jeers of men, the confusion of falsehood, and the panic of treachery, God would send his ministering angels to lift them from the mire and surround them with a protecting power. God would not abandon the psalmist cut off from the society of men but would deal compassionately with him. As the Warrior, God would set his bow against the wicked and trample them under his feet, and, as the Rock, he would shelter and protect his own until the hour of his triumph came.

These more recently composed hymns of the Qumran Sect may not equal the best of the Old Testament psalms in beauty of style and structure, but as expressions of faith and trust they are moving revelations of the vitality and depth of its spiritual life. The genuineness of faith's struggle against doubt, the triumph of the soul in the midst of adversity, and the confident hope in God's unfailing power, already tested in previous crises, lift these poems far above the trivial and the sentimental. They were created out of the elemental realities of life, and their creators have expressed themselves with depth of feeling, sensitivity, and perception. The result of their efforts to express their own intense yearnings for communion with God and things eternal and to voice their profound sense of gratitude for God's disclosure of his abundant love was the creation of a liturgy

of devotion. Having drunk from the inexhaustible fountain of God's grace, these psalmists nourished the souls of men thirsting for eternal life. Having seen the brilliant light of God's glory, they were able to dispel the dark nights of the soul, and having endured a suffering unto death, they had found courage and hope—a hope for a new life in a new age. Out of the depths they had called upon God and found assurance of deliverance, and out of their hymns the members of the Qumran brotherhood could take words of help and comfort to meet the strain and stress of life's continuous effort to achieve purity of soul and singleness of devotion.

Among the published and unpublished manuscripts from Qumran, there exist fragments of other types of writings that do not lend themselves readily to classification. These include lists of priests, benedictions, and beatitudes, texts bearing upon festival observance and even texts written as cryptograms or with cryptographic elements. Mention will be made of them below as occasion may require. For present purposes it is important to keep in mind, rather, the five major categories listed, to realize how completely this massive Qumran literature is dominated by the hope of and search for redemption, and to understand what it was that set the Sect apart from other groups within the same tradition. Though not relinquishing a jot or tittle from the Law of Moses, the Sectaries of Qumran could not with the Sadducees regard the Law as the sole authority or bow to the necessity of compromise with the secular powers. Though similarly devoted to observance, they could not share with the Pharisees the optimistic belief that ordinary men might with proper guidance acquire sufficient virtuosity in the application of the Law to be able to live righteously in their inherited social order and environment. Though not pacifists in principle, they could not with the Zealots undertake aggressive action to throw off the yoke of foreign domination and thereby expect to help bring on the Day of the Lord.

Standing within the Old Testament religion of redemption, the Sectaries sought another way. As they viewed the contemporary scene, they were convinced that evil and corruption prevailed in the land and that only a righteous remnant could have any hope of salvation. Therefore, they fled from the threat of contamination and

isolated themselves in the wilderness to establish a monastic refuge for men who desired to live in a community wholly dedicated to the obedience of God's will. With heroic zeal they tried to establish a Judaism of an unusually high order. The documents which their library contained and which were copied and produced in their scriptorium remain as silent but remarkable testimony to their devoted effort.

During the early years of the first century of our era, the years that represent the second phase in the history of the Qumran settlement, there occurred a further development in the religious life of the Jewish people that led eventually to the formation of the Christian Church.⁷ This Christian community also produced a literature, the literature of the New Testament, and the range and the character of its documents are to be considered here by way of comparison to the Qumran material.

What the literature of the early Church might have looked like if it had suddenly and recently been brought to light by archeological excavation we can only speculate. Certainly the individual documents that we have known for so long would have been in a more fragmentary state and the problems of dating them and of interpreting their individual passages would have been much greater. It is likely, moreover, that the literature would have been more varied and more extensive than it actually is. Indeed, with the Qumran material available for comparison, it may be necessary for us to revise the conception so popular in recent times, the conception that most of what the Church transmitted it first handed on orally. The composition and the use of written documents in religious circles can now be seen to have been much more common in Palestine before and at the beginning of our era than had previously been thought likely. The Christian Church of Palestine during the first thirty years of its history may therefore have had many more documents than we had thought or have knowledge of. But a word of

⁷ On the several periods in the occupation of the Qumran site, separated as they are by a break during the years 31-4 B.C., see now the definitive statement of R. de Vaux, *L'archéologie et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Schweich Lectures, London, 1961), pp. 86-94, and previously, J. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Penguin Books, 1956), pp. 84-86.

caution is in order in this connection. Such additional early Christian documents, if they once existed, should not be re-created by the dissection of extant New Testament writings. The procedure of taking the gospels we do have and of dividing them to discover earlier proto-gospels was carried to its own absurd extreme at the beginning of this century. Nor should the Qumran discoveries be taken to add new plausibility to theories about the Aramaic origin of the biblical gospels. Such theories must continue to stand on their own feet and be judged on their own merits, for all that the Qumran material can be said to suggest is that there may well have been more and other Christian documents in Palestine than we have hitherto imagined, many of which may well have been in Aramaic.

In the literature of the Christian Church actually known to us from the New Testament, the first category is that of the gospels. Gospels are indeed typical of Christian literary production and the number of those produced is much greater than the four that became canonical, as the list of the known apocrypha and the new discoveries at Chenoboskion indicate. Now the Essene movement, as we know it from the Qumran literature, produced no gospels, and this points up a significant difference between the literatures of the two communities, the reason for which it is important to set forth.

Ultimately, it is clear, the difference between the two literatures on this point derives from the persons of the founders of the two communities who, as historical persons, will be discussed in chapter iv. What is important in this context is the fact that the founder of the Qumran Sect, the Teacher of Righteousness, was a priest, a man of scholarly bent and learning, while Jesus represented the outlook of the non-professional classes in which the traditional piety of the Prophets and the Psalter lived on without benefit of special training. The Teacher of Righteousness created a pattern of systematic verse-by-verse interpretation of Scripture, applying it to the needs of the contemporary situation as he understood it, while Jesus engaged in public dispute and expressed himself in apothegmatic utterances or by means of parables. Furthermore, while the Teacher of Righteousness may have pronounced against his opponents dire threats of an impending divine judgment, Jesus, finding the powers of a new divine age already operating, found himself casting out demons and

performing healings thanks to the help of the "finger of God" (Luke 11:20).

The differences between the two founders in background, teaching, and actions has an important bearing upon the nature of the tradition handed down concerning them. In the case of Jesus there came to exist among his followers a body of information consisting of sayings and discourses—didactic, prophetic, and parabolic—of narratives of discussions or controversies, and of tales of "mighty works." This type of material, without real parallel in the Qumran tradition about the Teacher of Righteousness, makes up a good part of the documents that we today call gospels and explains in part the existence in Christian literature of a type of product other than that produced at Qumran.

Of course, the documents that we today call gospels were not originally known by that name. The men of the apostolic age spoke of them as records of the things "said and done" by Jesus or as "recollections." When the word "gospel" was first applied to the writings that now are identified by it, the assumption was that there was and could be only one gospel. This was the message of the glad tidings about God's redemption of his people, in the sense in which it had been proclaimed especially by Isaiah (e.g., 61:1). The documents we call gospels were at first this one "glad tidings" according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John, as the case might be. But the development of the nomenclature implies that something more went into the composition of this type of document than what has already been considered, and this element must not be overlooked in any comparison of Qumran and Christian literature.

The Christian and the Qumran communities are at one in the fact that what they transmitted to posterity about their founders was what they saw with the eyes of faith. They speak of the founders not in scientific detachment but in commitment to them as norms of thought and conduct, the inspired revealers of the divine will. Hence, when the Teacher of Righteousness was removed from the scene by the action of the Wicked Priest, his disciples perpetuated the memory of his person and continued both his way of life and his interpretation of the Scripture. But they did not write "recollections" of him in systematic form and assigned to him no particular

role in the final judgment and in the new order of the world that was to follow judgment. The peculiar feature of the relation between Jesus and his disciples is that this relation did not stop with his removal from the scene. To the impact he had made upon them while he ministered to their needs and those of others was added the force of two other sets of experiences that they connected with him, the resurrection appearances and the pentecostal experiences. These affected their understanding of him quite as profoundly as anything he had said and done in their midst at an earlier time. The experiences themselves and a whole congeries of circumstances attendant upon them combined to produce an understanding of the "glad tidings" much richer than the recollections of the "things said and done" and of the "mighty works." Having become a part of this tradition, they assisted in creating in the gospels a type of document new and unique in the Hebrew and Jewish literatures of redemption. Indeed, these same factors have left their mark upon almost everything else that the early Christian community produced by way of written documents. In addition they became the occasion for the development of certain types of documents other than gospels, types that must also be considered in any comparison of Christian and Qumran materials. The connection between the experiences and these other types of documents must be briefly outlined.

The importance for his disciples of the experiences that began so shortly after Jesus' death can hardly be exaggerated. This importance had many aspects. The resurrection experiences signified the divine validation of the faith which his disciples had had in Jesus and the hopes they had associated with him. The experiences underlined his unique importance in God's plan of redemption and meant that the whole terminal process in which resurrection generally had a place was demonstrably in operation. The pentecostal experiences only enhanced this conviction. In them the disciples found proof and demonstration of the fact that the new life in the Kingdom of God had already begun. Support was given to this belief by the Old Testament prophecy which said that in the last days God would pour out his Spirit upon all flesh (Joel 2:28). Soon they could therefore expect to see Jesus returning upon the clouds for judgment as Son of Man (Dan. 7:13).

These momentous developments had practical side effects. They served to knit the disciple group together and gave it an exalted conception of its role in the process of redemption. Out of the entire nation God had chosen them to be in a very special way the recipients of his favor. More than that, the tumultuous nature of their ecstatic experiences and the fact that Jesus' miraculous powers were now seen to be working through them made them figures of note at Jerusalem. They came automatically to the attention of the populace and under the scrutiny of the authorities as a special group within the religious community. Finally, they were filled with the desire to witness to the importance of what had happened to them and what they believed.

But the earliest Christian community at Jerusalem did not at once proceed to write down the biblical gospels or any of the other documents in the New Testament. Before this could be done three other things had still to happen. The first was the intense preoccupation of the members of the community with the antecedents of what they had experienced. What, they inquired, were the antecedents of Jesus? What were the circumstances of his birth? Who were his ultimate ancestors? Under what circumstances had he entered upon his ministry? What was there in the Scriptures that gave intimation of his coming and what did the Scriptures say about him? The second thing that had to happen was the development of differences of point of view between the nuclear group of the disciples and some of those who had been added to the community, differences regarding administrative procedure within the community and apparently also differences regarding the implications of the faith. The Book of Acts calls those whom these differences set apart the "Hellenists" (Acts 6:1). The third thing that had to happen was that the religious authorities at Jerusalem felt compelled to take drastic action, especially against the Hellenist group, in consequence of which the leaders of the group betook themselves to the coastal cities of Palestine and Syria where they proceeded to witness and testify to any and all who would listen.

All three of these developments had a further bearing upon the the origin of our four canonical gospels. They served to enrich the tradition recorded in them with the nativity stories, the genealogies,

the references to the fulfilment of Scripture, and the concern for the immediate future. Indeed, they served to bring about the composition of gospels generally, for it was only in proportion as Christ began to be preached at some remove from the seat of the Jerusalem community that the need for communicating the one gospel in various written forms became pressing. But the developments mentioned played their part also in the production of other types of New Testament literature. This is obvious, in the first place, in the case of the Book of Acts, which, as "Book Two" of the Gospel of Luke, continues the theme of the "things said and done" but applies it to the apostolic age, telling the story of the missionary efforts that stemmed from the life of the Jerusalem community.

What has been said above about the absence from the literature of Qumran of anything like a summary record of "things said and done" by the founder of the Sect applies here as well. Not only did the Sectaries fail to record more than the sketchiest memories of the life of their Teacher of Righteousness and of his great clash with the Wicked Priest; they also failed to set down during the more than two centuries of their existence a written record of the succession and the work of their later leaders. Conceivably the fact that they remained localized by the side of the Dead Sea had something to do with this. They had not the same compelling need for written records as the expanding Christian Church. But this is not enough. Communication of the "things said and done," whether by Jesus or by the apostles, was of the essence for the Christian community in a way in which it was not for the Qumran Sectaries. The Sectaries, by taking refuge in the wilderness and preparing themselves for the future, had not only left the world, but, in a sense, they also made do with a minimum of history. The Christians, by contrast, were conscious of being caught up in a momentous sweep of events that included their founder and themselves, and this gave their literature a narrative emphasis far in excess of that produced by the Qumran Sect.

The missionary expansion of the Church, stemming from the developments at Jerusalem described above, was the occasion for the creation of still another category of New Testament writings, that of the letters. The pioneer in this form of composition as practiced

by the Christian community was, of course, the apostle Paul. Paul was in all respects an amazing person. No one in the entire history of Christianity had a more profound effect upon the development of the Church than he, and the surprising thing is that within a period of thirty years after his death someone in the early Church, the writer of Acts, was sufficiently aware of this fact to leave us an account of his missionary efforts. At this early and crucial period of its history, the Church needed someone who could so formulate its relation to the Jewish heritage as to bring out its essential character and at the same time make it meaningful to the people of the larger Mediterranean world. By disposition, and as a Jew born and brought up at Tarsus in Cilicia, Paul was uniquely prepared to produce this formulation. With his work as a missionary agent the Church came to associate a collection of fourteen letters, of which eight are generally recognized as his, one (Hebrews) as clearly not his, and five (Ephesians and the Pastoral Letters) as either by him or, more probably, by his immediate associates and successors.

The letter as an instrument of religious self-expression is another type of document not represented in the Qumran finds. In this category also the early Christian literature stands apart from that of the Sectaries. Negatively the reason for this is implicit in what has already been said about the necessity of communication to those near by and far off, which the Christians felt incumbent upon themselves. Positively the reason is to be found in the transition of the Church from Palestine to the larger Mediterranean world, where the letter as a form of communication had had a longer and much richer history than in Palestine. Of course, not all of the letters of the New Testament are of one kind. Paul's Letter to Philemon, for instance, is so specific in its occasion and so personal in its substance that, except perhaps for its salutation, it might well have had parallels at Qumran or, for that matter, in any other religious community. But the majority of Paul's letters, and the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles as well, represent a use of the letter form for didactic purposes that belongs in quite another context. The context is that of the collected letters of Cicero, Seneca, and Pliny the Younger, many of which were intended for wide public use and some of which have a distinctly didactic character. Paul's letters differ from these in certain

respects, particularly in the almost liturgical formulation of the salutations and the closing words and in the driving urge of the body of the letters to obtain from their readers a commitment to the theological ideas and the practical wisdom expressed. These features and the subject matter as such make the letters of Paul classic elements of the Christian literature of redemption. But as to type they belong to the Greek and Roman world and are thus leagues removed from what was being produced in the wilderness retreat of Qumran.

The third and last among the categories of early Christian writings with which we have to deal here is that of apocalypses. This is a type of composition which the Christian community and the Qumran Sect do have in common. It is Palestinian and Jewish in origin, having no parallels in the larger Mediterranean world and having roots in the visions of the exilic and post-exilic Hebrew prophets and in the biblical Book of Daniel. Its ultimate premises are a teleological interpretation of history and the assurance that God will visit condign punishment upon those who oppose his will, while rewarding those who remain faithful to him. The immediate occasion for every document of this type is the conviction of the writer that the world is out of joint, that the forces of unrighteousness are currently overriding righteousness, and that God will therefore now intervene to redress the wrong and to give triumph to the right. The premises in question were, of course, common to all heirs of the Hebrew tradition, Sectaries and Christians alike, and occasions for faith to override present difficulties by envisioning its own vindication were provided in both camps. For the Christian community the first occasion for the production of apocalyptic writing seems to have come at a relatively early date in Palestine itself. The product of the occasion is an apocalyptic poem now incorporated in chapter 13 of the Gospel of Mark. Its nature and the circumstances that evoked it will concern us in a later chapter. The outstanding document of this type in the New Testament is naturally the Book of Revelation. It was written not in Palestine but on the island of Patmos off the Roman province of Asia at the end of the first century of our era and has as its occasion a serious threat to the Christian faith from the side of those who in the province

of Asia represented the forces of pagan religion and the authority of the Roman government. It stands aside, therefore, from the environment of Qumran, but the connections with the Sectarian point of view and tradition are closer than the circumstances would seem to indicate.

If one were to extend this survey of types of early Christian writing beyond the pale of the New Testament, there would be still other documents that on formal grounds would invite comparison with the literature of Qumran. One such type is that which has its earliest representative in the document called the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* and more commonly known by its Greek name as the Didache. Dated by scholars to the first quarter of the second century of our era and classed with the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, it is in effect a manual of discipline and hence analogous to the Manual of the Qumran Sect. Here are set forth the regulations for the ethical life of the Christian communities, for the function of its leaders—apostles, prophets, and teachers—and for the celebration of its rites and observances. The document has antecedents that go far back into the history of the Christian communities of Palestine and provides the impetus for a long succession of writings that go under various names in the literature of the developing Church. The Didache and the Qumran Manual together bring into sharper focus the character of one of the writings included among the Catholic Epistles of the New Testament. This is the so-called Epistle of James, which is a letter in name only, and is, in fact, so completely and so traditionally a collection of maxims and rules of conduct that its Christian origin has occasionally been seriously questioned by scholars.

The fact that so much of the literature of the New Testament, its gospels, its Book of Acts, and most of its letters, represents types foreign to those produced at Qumran should not blind us to relations that do exist between the documents of the two groups. Such relations will quickly be evident to anyone who examines the New Testament literature with an eye to the nature of the subject matter it contains and with due attention to the point of view of the authors. To this we now turn.

Beginning in this instance with the category of the apocalyptic

writings, it is clear that the relations between the Book of Revelation and the literature of Qumran are by no means limited to form and type. For the Christian author, Satan has the same importance as does Belial for the Sect, and the conflict is between his kingdom and God's. God's final triumph will bring blessing to his saints, who in the Book of Revelation will be redeemed for many of the same reasons given for the Sectaries' expectation of salvation. They are the elect who have remained faithful (Rev. 17:14) and have remained chaste because they have not defiled themselves with women. For the Sectaries and for the writer of Revelation, the Kingdom of God was to be a paradise where women were to be excluded (Rev. 14:4). No lie was found in their mouth (Rev. 14:5); they had kept the commandments (Rev. 14:12); and they were searching for the fountain of living water (Rev. 7:17) and for someone worthy to read the book, presumably the book of the Law. In the midst of terrible persecutions they were to take their garments and wait patiently (Rev. 6:11); moreover, they were not to be caught naked on the judgment day without their white garments (Rev. 16:15). Christ stands at the door and knocks for entrance, that he may come in and sup, thus giving a messianic character to the meal (Rev. 3:20). This desire for entrance is followed by what must have been originally a eucharist service of worship. When victory comes to the persecuted saints, they will be redeemed, to be priests of God (Rev. 20:6), and the twelve apostles of Christ will be the foundation for the new city. The wall around the city will have twelve gates over which the twelve names of the sons of Israel will be inscribed (Rev. 21:12-14). There is apparently a close relationship between the redeemed Christians and the twelve tribes of Israel who will enter the new city each through his own gate. The multitudes from every nation will throng into the streets of the New Jerusalem (Rev. 7:2-8). The ideology is that of the Sect. The great difference is that it will be Christ who leads them to the living waters; it is the slain Lamb who is worthy to open the book and read, and redemption belongs to the Christian saints because they have kept the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus (Rev. 14:12). It is the Song of Moses *and* the Lamb which they sing (Rev. 15:3), and their garments are made white by washing them in the blood of the Lamb,

who becomes the conquering Lamb and the fierce warrior in the final conflict between God and Satan (Rev. 17:13-14, 19:11). The similarities noted by scholars, together with those just listed, seem to rule out coincidence and indicate the possibility of rather direct acquaintance with Qumran apocalyptic developments on the part of a Christian author composing a counterpart to Qumran apocalyptic works.

Other details previously noted by scholars who have called attention to the similarities between the Book of Revelation and the apocalyptic material of the Qumran Sect are the frequent references in the Book of Revelation and in the Habakkuk Commentary to the phrase "his servants the prophets," the making of an acrostic on the word "Amen," as in the tenth column of the Manual of Discipline, the mysterious reference to the woman who gives birth to a male child who is in turn to rule all the nations with a rod of iron.⁸

Coming now to the epistolary portion of the New Testament, it will be clear to anyone even slightly familiar with the extensive scholarly literature on the subject, that there are grounds for associating some of its concepts and materials with those revealed in the Qumran texts. In this part of the New Testament it is the letters of Paul that have received most attention and that for good and sufficient reason. Paul's writings are always intimate and revealing. They record as no other early Christian documents do the inner struggles of the author to overcome the insufficiencies of his moral self and to achieve assurance of salvation. What makes the struggle so intense is a combination of three factors, namely, first, an exalted conception of the divine demands, second, a profound sense of personal unworthiness and, third, the belief that evil powers are working in and through the human constitution to prejudice a favorable outcome. All of these factors are demonstrably present in the religious life of the Qumran Sectaries. Emphasis in the comparison of the Qumran documents with the letters of Paul therefore falls upon Romans 6-8, and here in turn upon such expressions as "the sin that dwells in me" (Rom. 7:17), the "flesh" that serves "the law of sin"

⁸ See Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 341.

(Rom. 7:25), and "the body of death" (Rom. 7:24).⁹ But much else invites comparison and will eventually receive fuller attention. It would be interesting to range alongside each other the biblical passages used by Paul and those of concern to the Qumran writers and to compare the use made of them. Certainly the key passage from Habakkuk 2:4, "the righteous shall live by his faith," quoted in Romans 1:17, deserves additional consideration. The biblical quotations of Paul have already at an earlier date raised the question whether the Christian Church of Paul's day had a collection of "testimonies, that is, proof-texts culled from Scripture for ready use by apostles and preachers."¹⁰ Now that we have collections of such materials from Qumran, a fuller study of the entire subject is in order. The same thing applies to the question about the early Christian catechism that was raised in connection with Paul's statement about "standard of teaching" in Romans 6:17.¹¹

Among the gospels, to which we now return, it is the Fourth Gospel and the Gospel of Matthew that have received most attention. In the years immediately prior to the Qumran discoveries, New Testament scholars had been making the effort to explain a certain dualistic element in the thought of the Fourth Evangelist by connecting it with ideas prevalent in gnostic circles.¹² The effort ran

⁹ For the discussion of the material see, for instance, W. Grossouw, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," *Studia Catholica*, XXVII (1952), 1-8; S. E. Johnson, "Paul and the Manual of Discipline," *HTR*, XLVIII (1955), 157-65; R. E. Murphy, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible* (Westminster, 1956), pp. 92-96; K. G. Kuhn, "New Light on Temptation, Sin and Flesh in the New Testament," and W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," both in K. Stendahl, *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York, 1957), pp. 94-113, 157-82; M. Burrows, *More Light*, pp. 119-22.

¹⁰ R. Harris and V. Burch, *Testimonies*, Part II (Cambridge, 1920), pp. 12-42.

¹¹ For the literature on this subject see W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago, 1957) s.v. *didaché*.

¹² See esp. R. Bultmann, "Das Evangelium des Johannes," in *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament* (Göttingen, 1950), pp. 14-19, and *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen, 1953), trans. K. Grobel as

afoul of two difficulties: the lack of gnostic sources sufficiently early to have served as sources for the evangelist's thought, and the dissimilarities between the gnostic and the Johannine dualism. With the discovery of the Scrolls, however, there has been found evidence of a type of dualistic thought early enough to overcome the first difficulty and sufficiently close in character to offer the possibility of a direct connection. The literature on the subject is already extensive.¹³ Among the writers who have dealt with the subject, R. E. Brown has shown with particular clarity how the specific details of the Sectaries' point of view apply to the evangelist's understanding of the created order, the struggle between two spiritual powers for control of the world, man's commitment to one or the other of these two spiritual powers, and the role of the sons of light in this struggle.¹⁴

In addition to this resemblance between the Johannine and Qumran dualistic outlook, which explained the nature of the phenomenal and moral world, the Fourth Evangelist agrees with the Sectaries in thinking of the redeemed sons of light as an exclusive rather than inclusive group. While the evangelist's affirmation that God gave his Son for the salvation of the whole sinful world is familiar (Jn. 3:16), it is not a typical representation of his thought. In contrast to the universalism of Jesus' and Paul's outlooks, this

Theology of the New Testament (2 vols.; New York, 1951-55), pp. 11, 12-14. Cf. C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge, 1954), pp. 102-14.

¹³ K. G. Kuhn in his article, "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament," *ZTK*, XLVII (1950), 192-211, and "Die Sekten-schrift und die iranische Religion," *ZTK*, XLV (1952), 245-60, was among the first to draw attention to the similarities of thought between the Fourth Gospel and the Qumran literature. See also W. F. Albright, "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of John," in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology: Studies in Honor of C. H. Dodd*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 153-71; R. E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," *CBQ*, XVII (1955), 403-19, 559-74; and L. Mowry, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Background for the Gospel of John," *BA*, XVII (1954), 78-97.

¹⁴ R. E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," pp. 403-19, 559-74.

evangelist limits the community by stressing that the Son was sent to save those whom God had given him to save, namely, the Church (cf. Jn. 17), and that the members of the Church were to love one another as Christ had loved them (Jn. 13:34). By stressing exclusivism, the evangelist attempts to deepen love between members of the Church and thus to have the Church stand as a testimony to the world that God had sent his Son to redeem its members. To be sure, the evangelist hesitates to press his exclusivism to an attitude of hatred for outsiders, but by implication he approaches this Qumran point of view.

Aside from these two major considerations, other points of possible contact—such as the evangelist's interest in reworking the Jewish calendar and his hostility toward the Jews and their Law—cannot be established unless one can prove that the evangelist's polemic against the Jews generally refers to the Sectaries specifically. Such a polemical attitude against John the Baptist's followers is implied in the evangelist's statements about John. But there is no clear indication of a similar critical attitude toward the Qumran Sect. This comment does not mean to imply that the Fourth Evangelist has not altered Sectarian dualism to bring it in line with his Christian beliefs. He claims that Christianity had actually found in Christ the true light of the world, who resolved the tension of the struggle between light and darkness (Jn. 1:5). The Church, therefore, was no longer living in expectation of one who would triumph over evil and darkness. Furthermore, by believing in Christ and by partaking of his nature, each man in his own struggle against darkness and perversion could achieve victory over the forces of evil. While there may be undercurrents of criticism of the Sect in this gospel, Brown is quite correct in cautioning against assuming that every reference to the Jews is a reference to the Sect.

The Fourth Evangelist's apparent acceptance of certain Qumran points of view raises the question of his possible association with the Sect. The question is difficult to answer completely, but three comments can be made. First, the Sect, in the opinion of the Fourth Evangelist, apparently does not threaten Christianity, as did the followers of John the Baptist. Second, the evangelist writes as one established in the Christian faith, for certain developments in Chris-

tian thought, particularly Pauline concepts, are presupposed. Third, the background of thought that is necessary to this gospel is very rich and diversified. It would seem likely, therefore, that the evangelist was not a Qumran convert to the Christian movement but had been born and raised in Christianity. Qumran concepts, like those of other religious groups, commended themselves to him as useful vehicles for his expression of Christian doctrine.

On the subject of the Gospel of Matthew, the most important book in recent years is that of Krister Stendahl.¹⁵ Stendahl rejects earlier efforts to understand Matthew as a document written to enhance the value of Mark for use in church services or to provide instructions for candidates for baptism and argues instead that the gospel's *Sitz im Leben* is that of the schools established for teachers and church leaders. In connection with the formulas used to introduce Old Testament quotations, Stendahl has pointed out that both the Sectaries and the First Evangelist quoted and interpreted Old Testament passages for similar purposes. Both wanted to prove that certain Old Testament promises and prophecies were being or had been fulfilled within the circles of their communities. Since this type of exegetical treatment of the Old Testament passages dominates the Gospel according to Matthew and since this evangelist is by no means the first or only Christian author to interpret the Old Testament for this purpose, Stendahl's argument is convincing. Apparently this gospel has taken the form of a handbook for teaching and administration within the Church because its author was trained in such a school. Whether he was trained in a Christian school or in the Qumran school depends upon how one interprets the data relevant to the possibility of initial instruction in one or the other of these communities. The survival of the Qumran community down to A.D. 68 certainly makes the option possible.

One point that comes up in this connection and that has perhaps received less consideration than it deserves is that made some time ago by Benjamin W. Bacon.¹⁶ It concerns the reorganization by

¹⁵ *The School of St. Matthew (Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsalien-sis, Vol. XX [Uppsala, 1954])*.

¹⁶ See his *Studies in Matthew* (New York, 1930).

Matthew of the collection of sayings of Jesus common to him and Luke and derived from the so-called Second Source, *Q*. Bacon has argued convincingly that the evangelist has organized this earlier material into five major blocks, each block being a thematically unified combination of Markan narrative material and *Q* didactic material. The evangelist's purpose apparently was to create a counterpart to the five books of the Mosaic Law for the Christian community. As a whole, these five sections of the gospel indicate that the First Evangelist has centered his account of things said and done by Jesus upon two foci, the Law and the community. The presentation of these two interrelated themes with their eschatological orientation was apparently as important for this Christian writer as for the members of the Qumran Sect. The unique interpretation given by him for the portrait of Jesus is that of a new law-giver who presents a code of higher righteousness for the Church (Matt. 5:17-20). Moreover, the Christian community will be judged on the final day of reckoning, not on the basis of its confession or its display of miraculous powers, but on its attempt to obey the laws of the code (Matt. 7:21-23). The formal arrangement of the material, therefore, suggests that the First Evangelist may have had his pre-Christian training in the Qumran school.

The question whether it is possible to go beyond such generalities to specific points of contact between the First Evangelist and the Qumran Sect turns upon his rendering of individual words of Jesus. The words in question are not those that can credibly be regarded as having been spoken by Jesus in the form given by Matthew. Similarities between such sayings and the teachings of Qumran bear primarily upon the question of Jesus' own relation to the Sect.¹⁷ Rather, attention needs to be paid in this connection to words that are quoted by the evangelist as having been spoken by Jesus but that, by comparison with Luke, reveal themselves as either adapted to changed conditions or as supplied by the Christian com-

¹⁷ Among the words of Jesus of this category to which attention needs to be paid are his teaching on man's role in the final judgment (Matt. 7:1), on love toward the enemy (Matt. 5:43), on the sanctity of the Sabbath day (Matt. 12:9-14), on anxiety (Matt. 6:25-33), and on the role of the community as the light of the world (Matt. 5:14).

munity that Matthew represents. Such are the words that concern the regulations on Church discipline (Matt. 18:15-17), possibly the law against the use of the oath (Matt. 5:33-34), the commendation of celibacy (Matt. 19:12), and the requirements for living according to a code of exceptional righteousness (Matt. 5:17-20). Scholars have frequently called attention to the similarity between the Matthean regulations on Church discipline and its close parallels in the Damascus Document (9:2) and the Manual of Discipline (6:1). Compared with the more radical formulation of this saying in Luke 17:3-4, the Matthean form is secondary and may well be an attempt to meet problems of ecclesiastical discipline along lines similar to Qumran procedures. According to the Lukan form of the saying, Jesus maintains that even under the most difficult circumstances one does not limit his attitude of love and forgiveness toward others. The Matthean form of the saying, on the contrary, states that an accused member of the community who cannot be convinced privately of his errors must be brought before witnesses for judgment. The procedure recommended by the First Evangelist is comparable to that of the Sectaries.

The antithetical formulation of Jesus' saying on oaths so confuses the issues of swearing and oath-taking that the translators of the Revised Standard Version have substituted the formulation of Jesus' word as it appears in James 5:12 for the Matthean form of the saying: that is James' "Let what you say be simply 'Yes' or 'No'" for Matthew's "Let your speech be yes, yes; no, no." The formulation of the saying according to the First Evangelist is best understood by comparing it with a statement found in Slavonic Enoch (49:1-2), "If there is no truth in men, let them swear by the words 'yea, yea' or else by 'nay, nay.'" Since Jews were not allowed to confirm an oath by using God's name explicitly or by referring to any one of God's possessions such as heaven, earth, or Jerusalem, the author of Slavonic Enoch suggests the functional equivalent of the oath "yea, yea, or nay, nay." The First Evangelist has made the same suggestion in contrast to Jesus' statement as reported by James. According to James, Jesus stated that the basis of oath-taking is rooted in man's suspicion of the presence of evil and that the only way of transcending the dilemma unsolved by the taking of oaths lies in integrity.

Since some scholars have overlooked the significance of the different formulations of this saying on oaths, there is some confusion regarding the question whether Jesus or the First Evangelist has rejected the use of the oath.¹⁸ A more careful analysis of the Matthean form suggests that, although Jesus rejected the use of the oath, the First Evangelist accepted the substitution of its functional equivalent. The First Evangelist, therefore, followed the practice of the Qumran Sect, which clearly stated that rather than use the name of God for confirming an oath its members were to substitute a word, whatever it may have been, for the name of God (Dam. Doc. 19:1).

The emphasis in the Gospel according to Matthew upon John the Baptist and Jesus as teachers and examples of righteousness, and upon Christianity as the way of righteousness, is a further significant link between this evangelist and the Qumran Sect. When Paul speaks of a righteousness which men may have, it is theirs because God has imputed the character of his righteousness to men and because men receive it through faith in Jesus Christ (Rom. 3:21-22). In contrast to Paul the First Evangelist thinks of righteousness in Qumran terms. As he understands it, John the Baptist came in the way of righteousness (Matt. 21:32) to prepare the way for a new lawgiver who would declare that the disciples' righteousness should exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. 5:20). What the laws of this higher righteousness involve has been spelled out in the collection of Jesus' sayings (Matt. 5-7).

Interestingly, this evangelist has combined the idea of scrupulous piety with the threat of God's final judgment, as did the Qumran Sect. These laws must be kept until heaven and earth pass away, when God will bring redemption for those who have achieved righteousness through discipline in Jesus' law. It is the author of Matthew who has Jesus make the comment to the rich man, "If you would enter life, keep the commandment" (Matt. 19:17; cf. Mark 10:19, Luke 18:20). Similarly this evangelist provides the motivation for Jesus' participation in John's baptismal rite (Matt. 3:14-15). Jesus declares that he cannot let the question regarding the propriety of the greater (Jesus) being baptized by the lesser (John the Baptist)

¹⁸ See K. Schubert's article, "The Sermon on the Mount and the Qumran Texts," in K. Stendahl, *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, p. 126.

interfere with his determination to exhibit in his own life the full measure of the righteousness demanded by him of others. Although Jesus himself did not need this baptism, his disciples did. He permitted it that he might be the perfect example for them.

The evidence of his editorial work suggests, therefore, that the writer of the Gospel of Matthew was originally a member of the Qumran Sect. Since he wrote after the fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70) and after the destruction also of the Qumran settlement (*ca.* A.D. 68), it is possible that he was among those who survived the disaster that overtook the Sect and found in the Christian brotherhood the medium for the satisfaction of his religious aspirations.

The comparison of the two literatures of redemption, the Sectar-ian and the Christian, that sprang from the ancient Hebrew stock, has revealed differences and relationships in both form and substance. If we knew more about the later history of the Qumran Sect, more particularly what happened to its members after the destruction of the Dead Sea settlement, the picture might be still clearer. It is unlikely that that history came to a complete end in A.D. 68. Since manuscripts were so highly treasured, it is probable that their texts were distributed and circulated in religious groups which continued after the disappearance of the Sect and which some of its members may have joined. The appearance of the Damascus Document in a genizah in a Jewish synagogue of Cairo, the inclusion of the Testaments of Levi and Naphtali in a larger work, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, and of parts of Enoch in the copy of the Ethiopic text of Enoch indicate that these documents continued to circulate and that people continued to treasure them. After the destruction of their community in 68, some of the Sectar-ies may have found their place in Judaism. Although the Sectar-ies had withdrawn from Judaism in an earlier era, it would have been possible for them to rejoin the larger Jewish group after A.D. 70. The destruction of the Temple was proof that God's judgment against the wicked priesthood had taken place. Furthermore, Judaism stressed the necessity of obeying God's commandments as a means of achieving righteousness before God. A majority of the Sect, however, may have been dispersed and found their place in religious groups of the Diaspora. It is possible that some of these Sectar-ies

went into certain gnostic groups that emphasized knowledge as a means of salvation, believed in a dualistic system as an explanation for the nature of the universe, led a strictly ascetic life, and used Old Testament texts with interpretation to give ancient support for their gnostic theories. They might also have joined such religious groups as the Hemerobaptists, who emphasized ritual purity by the performance of daily lustrations. Contacts between the Sectaries and the apostolic Church as seen in the *Didache*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and possibly in the *Shepherd of Hermas* suggest that they might have found their way into the Christian community. It would seem, therefore, that even though their life as a Sect came to an early end, their ideas continued to survive as influential or at least as contributing elements in these later religious groups.

The present chapter has passed in review the collections of documents upon which all knowledge of the Qumran Sect and of the early Church depends. Such a review has its own justification and leads to its own conclusions, positive and negative. From it we turn now to the comparison of the communities themselves, their origin, their nature, their religious ideas and rites. Certainly the point at which to begin is that of the nature of the communities, their leaders, and their founders.

CHAPTER TWO

The Nature of the Two Communities

With the successful revolt of the Maccabean rural priests against the Seleucid kings, who had tried to force Hellenistic culture upon the Jews, the traditional Jewish piety seemed more secure than it had been for centuries. With each succeeding generation of the new ruling Maccabean high-priestly dynasty, however, the Jews witnessed a tragic capitulation to the very trends against which this household had fought. The spectacle of the subservience of traditional piety to politically ambitious rulers was more than many of the devoutly pious and sensitive souls could endure. This gave rise to various religious groups within Judaism, among whom the Hasidim, the Qumran Sectaries, and the Pharisees are the best known. The two centuries that followed, in the course of which Palestine came under the equally hateful rule of the Herodians and the Romans, saw the rise of still further groups within Judaism, the Baptist group, the Christian group, and the Zealots. One thing the several groups had in common was their devotion to the ancestral tradition and the desire to find some way to maintain the traditions of the nation's piety. But each had its own program for the achievement of the objective.

Interest attaches here directly to only two of the several groups, the Qumran Sectaries and the Christian community. In the present context the question at issue is what it was that set each of the groups apart from the religious entity of the Jewish nation and what are the points of similarity and dissimilarity between them. In the preceding chapter we have already seen that persecution was a factor in the development in both cases, but this is a contributing cir-

cumstance rather than a basic cause. Here it is necessary to probe deeper and to try to discover the basic principles constitutive of the two groups.

When the Qumran Sect and the early Christian community first come into view, they are found in quite different localities. The preferred haunt of the Sect, according to its own writings and those of Philo, Pliny, and Josephus, was the wilderness at the northwestern end of the Dead Sea. The early Christians, on the other hand, appeared in the large cities, at first in Jerusalem and then, as the program of their missionary work developed, in Samaria, the coastal cities of Palestine, Antioch, the cities of Asia Minor and of Greece, and finally in Rome itself. Caution must be used in considering this phenomenon, for, according to Josephus, some of the Essenes lived in the villages and towns of Palestine, and undoubtedly there were Christian communities in the rural regions of Galilee and possibly of Judea. However, to understand the distinctive character of the two groups, it is necessary to attempt to answer the question: why did the Qumran Sect prefer to establish a religious center in the wilderness near the shores of the Dead Sea in contrast to the Church's preference for working in the large urban centers?

Was the Sectaries' retreat to the wilderness motivated merely by a weariness of life, as Pliny implied, or were there more creative motives prompting them to isolate themselves geographically from their countrymen? Familiarity with the literature of the Bible indicates that the wilderness was not only a locale in which the Israelite was exposed to the dangers of wild beasts and demonic forces but also a region where the solitary individual, troubled by religious issues, sought clarification. Incidents that come to mind are Elijah's flight to the wilderness after his contest with the priests of Baal on Mount Carmel, Amos' reflections in the wilderness of Tekoa after witnessing the unjust practices of his countrymen, John the Baptist's retreat to the wilderness of the Jordan after seeing the corruptness of the Jerusalem priesthood, Jesus' experience of temptation in the wilderness after his baptism, and Paul's three-year sojourn in Arabia after the vision on the Damascus road. These experiences, however, occurred to individuals and were not the experiences of a community. It seems likely, therefore, that some compulsion other than

the simple need for clarification drove the Sectaries to the desert area bordering the Dead Sea.

Biblical documents tell of only one occasion when a comparable experience occurred to a community. The event was the famous episode of Israel's forty-year sojourn in the wilderness between Egypt and Palestine when Moses and the fleeing Israelites were found by God at Mount Sinai. Significantly, the Sect interpreted Isaiah's vision of God coming to Israel on a prepared and level highway through the desert (Is. 40:3) by associating it with the Mosaic period and by applying the oracle to its own community. The Sectaries went to the wilderness, they declare,

to prepare there the way of the Lord; as it is written, "in the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord; make straight in the desert a highway for our God:" this is the study of the law, as he commanded through Moses, to do according to all that has been revealed from time to time, and as the prophets revealed by his Holy Spirit.¹

The statement is pregnant with significant concepts springing from the Law and the Prophets and bears upon the theme of Israel's redemption. By their retreat into the wilderness, the Sectaries hoped to become the instrument that might prepare the avenue for God's approach to Israel, for his final and complete manifestation of himself to his people, and thus for his eternal dwelling with them. The answer to the question, how could they prepare the way, came from Israel's history. By their wilderness retreat they sought to recapture that great moment when God's voice had sounded forth clearly in the desert places to a community bound to its God and when God and his people had taken their first vows of loyalty to each other. On Israel's part her vow of steadfast obedience involved the keeping of God's Law as revealed to Moses and as that Law continued to be revealed through God's inspired prophets. Obviously to remain loyal, therefore, meant the continuous search into the Law and a determined effort to fulfil all its requirements. The task

¹ Manual of Discipline 8:14-16 (Burrows' translation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York, 1955], p. 382).

was one which the Sectaries believed could be undertaken only by re-creating the circumstances of the first wilderness experience.

As the passage quoted above indicates, the Sectaries had more than an archaistic interest in the Mosaic period. The first wilderness community faced overwhelming odds in its effort to survive and ultimately to win its way victoriously into the land of promise. As this first community endured the long forty-year sojourn with trust in God and hope of success, so the Sectaries believed that God would strengthen them during a comparable forty-year period in the final war of the great eschatological drama. As victors they would judge all the wicked nations and the wicked among God's own people. Victory had never been cheaply won. But beyond the suffering and hardships of bitter struggle was entrance into the eternal Kingdom of God. The Sectaries took courage in the belief that the events of Israel's life were not aimless. Triumph had been granted in a past era even though it had not been one of perfect loyalty. The second wilderness community had every expectation, therefore, that in the momentous, climactic prelude to the goal of history God would uphold and sustain them. Hence it is not surprising to find a note of triumph at the conclusion of the War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness.

Today is his appointed time to lay low and to make fall the prince of the dominion of wickedness; and he will send eternal help to the lot he has redeemed by the power of the angel he has made glorious for rule, Michael, in eternal light, to give light in joy to all Israel, peace and blessing to the lot of God, to exalt among the gods the rule of Michael and the dominion of Israel over all flesh. Righteousness shall rejoice in the high places, and all the sons of his truth shall be joyful in eternal knowledge. And you, sons of his covenant, be strong in the crucible of God until he waves his hand and fills his crucibles with his mysteries that you may stand.²

Returning to the Manual of Discipline, we find the Qumran author using a traditional metaphor, that of Israel as God's planting,

² The War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness 18:10-14 (Burrows' translation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 399).

to express another, though similar, reason for the Sectaries' flight to the desert.

When these things [referring to the activities of the Sectaries] come to pass in Israel, the council of the community will be established in truth for an eternal planting, a holy house for Israel, a foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron, true witnesses for justice and the elect by God's will, to make atonement for the land and to render to the wicked their recompense—this is the tested wall, a precious cornerstone; its foundations will not tremble or flee from their place—a most holy dwelling for Aaron with eternal knowledge for a covenant of justice and to offer a pleasing fragrance, and a house of perfection and truth in Israel to establish a covenant for eternal statutes. And they shall be accepted to make atonement for the land and to decide the judgment of wickedness, and there shall be no error.³

The metaphor of Israel as God's planting is a familiar one in the writings of the prophets and psalmists. From Isaiah's day on it was possible to believe that the holy seed planted by God at Mount Sinai could be destroyed by him because of Israel's ingratitude and unrighteousness. Also from Isaiah's day on it was conceivable that God would save a holy seed from the old planting and begin anew and that the new plant would produce worthy fruit. The planting was God's and the mysterious power to produce good fruit also came from God. Nevertheless, it was Israel's responsibility to respond to the divine purpose for which she was created and planted. If she chose another course of action, God could lop off the boughs until only a stump remained. Or, according to one of the psalmists, those who meditated on the Law day and night were like a tree planted by streams of water which brought fruit in its season, but others were like chaff blown away by the wind (Ps. 1:3-4). In New Testament times the metaphor continued to be expressive, for John the Baptist could conceive of the total destruction of the planting (Matt. 3:10), while Paul thought of the possibility of cutting off the old and unproductive limbs and replacing them with new branches grafted onto the old trunk (Rom. 11:17-20). Applying to them-

³ Manual of Discipline 8:4-10 (Burrows' translation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 381-82).

selves the Old Testament metaphor, the Sectaries were convinced that they were the holy seed or the holy remnant and that they should give the seed an opportunity for growth in favorable soil by removing themselves from the harmful forces which had prevented normal growth in previous eras. So used, the metaphor recalls the essential character of Israel's nature: God's covenanted and elect people. It referred to the judgments pronounced upon Israel throughout her history by men who recognized that as a nation she was not producing fruits worthy of redemption. It also referred to a hope for the production of good fruit from a healthy remnant of the diseased plant.

In their documents the Sectaries accepted this prophetic view of history which the metaphor of Israel as God's planting symbolized. They, as the prophets of old, passed judgment upon those Jews who in the past and in their own day wilfully departed from the moral and religious standards given her by God. Their allusions to and rehearsals of her inglorious decisions to neglect the will of God did not spring from a pedantic interest in keeping a record of Israel's tragic mistakes of the past for antiquarian purposes but from a desire to avoid the errors of the past that would bring God's judgment upon them. In their opinion their own situation was comparable in many ways to those of earlier eras. Jacob's sons had gone astray and so brought upon themselves Israel's enslavement in Egypt. Even though God had delivered them from this oppression through Moses' leadership, the vast majority had complained against God, had forsaken his covenant, and in the stubbornness of their hearts had followed their own will. Therefore, God in his wrath had punished his people again by not allowing the Israelites of Moses' own generation to enter the land promised to them. Israel followed this pattern of imperfect response to God's will even to the days of Nebuchadnezzar who had served as God's instrument to crush the political life of the Jewish nation. Throughout all these periods, however, God had "caused to sprout from Israel and Aaron a root of planting to inherit his land," and, even though few in number, the remnant continued to survive. In line with the implications of the metaphor and their interpretation of history and of contemporary conditions, the Sectaries believed not only that they were ful-

filling the role of the remnant but also that they were fulfilling it in the last period of the world's history.

The Damascus Document opens with God's judgment upon Israel at the time of Jerusalem's destruction under Nebuchadnezzar and continues by saying that for about four-hundred years a remnant remained which finally confessed its guilt and groped for the true way. God seeing the perfection of their hearts sent them a Teacher of Righteousness to guide them. Persecution of the Sect began at this moment and created thereby an irreparable breach separating the remnant from the rest of the Jews. The leader of the persecuting opponents created moral chaos in society, violated the statutes of the covenant, and persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness and all those who believed in his instruction. The members of this impious and immoral party of opposition were the wicked priests who showed no regard for the laws regulating the requirement of purification of the Temple clergy. Thus they defiled God's sanctuary in Jerusalem and the holy Spirit within them by saying that God's laws were of no importance since he had never established them. Not content to drive all the righteous out of Jerusalem and to turn that city into a center of blood and violence, the wicked priests turned their energies against the cities of Judah where they plundered the poor, the simple ones of Judah, who were the doers of the Law. Both groups were about to witness God's judgment. The godless would be destroyed, while those who had withdrawn from them would become God's eternal planting, which he had already begun to nourish with living water.

Reference to the wilderness community of the Mosaic period and the prophetic metaphor of God's planting expressed for the Sectaries a sense of promise and fulfilment, of traditional hopes and renewed expectations. Although present circumstances did not give much encouragement for such convictions, their search into the past created within the Sect a feeling of its destined significance. God had established a covenant with his people the terms of which he would not renounce. His promise guaranteed the ultimate glory of his covenanted people, even though it might be faithless, because he would remain faithful. Although previous generations had lost their right to belong to the covenant, God had found a few right-

eous individuals, such as the patriarchs and Moses, with whom he could continue his covenant-bond. The Sectaries believed that they inherited the rights of the ancient promises and that, as heirs, and indeed as the last heirs, of the covenant they would experience the final blessings of the covenant-bond. Jeremiah's prophecy of the new covenant was being fulfilled in their day and within their group. This conviction led them to believe that their community had become the holy dwelling place of God.

In the two passages quoted above from the Manual of Discipline, the Qumran author maintains that by its flight to the desert the Sect will establish "a foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron." The significance of this expectation is explained more fully in a document previously known, the book of Jubilees, fragments of which were recovered from the Qumran caves. Three times in the past, it said, God had tried to create holy places upon the earth for his people: first, in the Garden of Eden, which was the Holy of Holies; then, Mount Sinai, the center of the desert; and finally, Mount Zion, the center of the earth (Jub. 8:19). But all these places had witnessed bitter disappointments. In the first holy place Adam and Eve by their decisions and actions made it impossible for the entire human race ever to re-enter God's Holy of Holies. In the desert the first covenanted community rebelled against God in the stubbornness of their own pride, and now Jerusalem was polluted by the wicked priests and the man of lies. God's elect, therefore, must separate themselves from perverse men and go into the wilderness to prepare the way of the Lord. The purpose of their separation had both protective and constructive motivations. Separation was needed in order to find a new place for the erection of a holy house for Israel, which was to be built upon unshakable foundations and in which would be set a precious cornerstone. According to the revelation given to Enoch, the chosen one of God, the wilderness where this house would be erected would become a new paradise with trees and plants watered by gushing streams (En. 28; cf. Ezek. 47: 8, 12). Then Eden, Sinai, and Zion would be renewed for the new creation (Jub. 4:26). Such were the hopes of the Sectaries who left behind them an unrighteous and thoroughly corrupt world and wished to dedicate themselves to the ways of peace and of righteous-

ness and to the performance of God's will as revealed in his holy laws.

The metaphors of the planting and of the building with unshakable foundations allude to another traditional concept of great importance for Israel; namely, to their election as God's covenanted people. Jeremiah's contribution to the covenant idea emphasized the necessity of the creation of a new covenant which in contrast to the old would place the Law in the heart of every man and would make it possible, therefore, for each individual to know God directly and immediately. While the Sectaries agreed with Jeremiah on the inadequacies of the old covenant, they, like the priestly writers of the Old Testament, did not stress the newness of the covenant so much as its eternal character. When the initiate took his vows, he understood that his entrance was into a covenant of eternal community and, consequently, that he was joining those to whom God had promised eternal peace, eternal light, eternal truth, and eternal glory. They called themselves God's eternal planting, for they believed that their community would survive the period of this world's destruction since it had originated in the heavenly world.

It is not difficult to illustrate the pervasive significance of this doctrine for the Sect. According to the Sectaries, they had entered a community which traced its line back through Moses, Abraham, Shem, Noah, Enoch, Mahalalel, Enos, Seth, and Adam, all of whom would serve to lay the foundations of heaven and to renew the eternal luminaries of heaven (Jub. 19:23-25). In contrast, the Pharisees in the *Pirke Aboth* traced the origins of their authority to Moses (*Pirke Aboth* 1:1). Some of the individuals in the Qumran line of antecedents had been chosen by God to receive secret revelations of his eternal world and had left written records of these eternal mysteries. Enoch, in particular, had been selected by God out of all the men of the earth for the revelation of the visible and invisible mysteries of his creation and of events to come and was, therefore, designated to be the redeemer of the sins of men (En. 12:1-4, 12-14). Similarly, the Sectaries reinterpreted the sacred treasures of their tradition as having their origin in the heavenly world and not in the periods of the patriarchs and of Moses. Circumcision, which served as a sign distinguishing God's people from

other nations, did not originate with Abraham but was revealed to him as an act already practiced in heaven by the angels of the presence and the angels of sanctification from the day of their creation (Jub. 15:9-14, 27). Circumcision, therefore, was the great sign of the eternal character of the covenant which God's people on earth must also adopt if they wished to join those of the heavenly host who were already among the members of the eternal covenant. Likewise, the Law as revealed to Moses had been written on heavenly tablets and had been observed by the angels in heaven before the world was created. Among the laws was one of particular importance, that of keeping the festivals at their appointed times, especially the Feast of Weeks. For the Sectaries, this festival celebrated the renewing of the covenant. Since the Sectaries believed themselves to be members of the eternal community of the blessed, they were given the things of eternity: the books with revelations of the eternal mysteries, the eternal Law, the eternal rite of circumcision, and the eternal decrees regarding the keeping of God's festivals.

The passages discussed so far indicate that the Qumran Sect was strongly convinced of its peculiar role as the elect remnant, the true Israel, destined by God to inherit the promises. From their study of the prophetic Book of Isaiah, a book which in a very special way nourished their faith, the Sectaries were well aware that the inheritance involved purification of the remnant through suffering. The remnant so cleansed would be established in the holy city of Jerusalem and would be the instrument prepared for God's coming to Zion. Further reading in the Book of Isaiah presented them with the figure of the Suffering Servant, a figure whose importance for the Sect is apparently indicated by the placing of the sign "x" in the margin of the Isaiah scroll.⁴ From these selected passages it is

⁴ The "x" sign appears in the margin of the following passages, Isaiah 32:1-2, 41:7-11, 41:25, 43:25-26, 49:7, 54:11-14, 55:3-4, 57:10, 66:5. For appearance of this mark, see the plates where the sign is indicated in Burrows' *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery* (2 vols.; New Haven, 1950-1951), I, Plates 17, 34, 35, 37, 41, 45, 47, 53. For discussions concerning the significance of the "x" sign, see I. Sonne, "The x-sign in the Isaiah Scroll," *VT*, IV (1954), 90-94, and J. L. Teicher, "The Christian Interpretation of the Sign x in the Isaiah Scroll," *VT*, V (1955), 189-98. Sonne claims that the sign indicates passages of great importance for the Qumran Sect's under-

possible to conjecture the significance of the Servant's role for the Sect's understanding of its own nature and destiny. It believed that God would not revoke the terms of the covenant made with Abraham but would preserve his chosen people through the work of his elect Servant. Although the Servant would endure hardship in discharging the responsibilities of that role, he could rely upon God to strengthen and uphold him. Wearied by the length of trials, the Servant need not abandon faith, for in the desert God's elect remnant would find newness of life and the light of God's salvation (Is. 57:10). Then the Servant, with no feeling of stubborn rebellion, would incline his ears to God's teaching. By his suffering he would make atonement for the land and be anointed with God's holy Spirit to restore Israel and to manifest God's glory to the kings and princes of the Gentiles (Is. 49:6-7). The manifestation of God's glory involved the Servant in a twofold task, the destruction of the lawless and the gathering-in of the righteous, who through the Servant would receive their just reward.⁶

Though certain that they were the redeemable remnant of the covenant and the eternal planting of God, the Sectaries were also aware of the non-automatic character of the covenant bond. Insofar as they were convinced that as a community they must renew the covenant yearly and that each individual should meditate daily at dawn and sunset upon the significance of belonging to the eternal community, they agreed with the prophets who had warned against irresponsible reliance upon the promises of the covenant (DSD 2: 19-26, 10:10). According to the Law of Moses, the germinal form of that realization went back to the first wilderness period when Moses tried to convey the immediacy of the covenant relationship

standing of its mission, while Teicher is convinced that the sign had special Christian significance and that the members who placed these signs in the margin were, therefore, Christian. See also W. H. Brownlee, "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls II," *BASOR*, CXXXV (1954), 33-38.

⁶ The significance of allusions to the Servant motif in the Qumran literature is debatable. I am inclined to agree with Burrows and others who suggest that the figure should be understood collectively and that the Servant refers to the Sect as a group. For Burrows' discussion of the problem, see *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 266-67.

to the fleeing Israelite slaves. It was not only with the patriarchs that God had established his covenant, according to the author of Deuteronomy as he reported Moses' words, but especially with those who were living there in the wilderness (Deut. 5:21). The Sectaries, who had patterned their life according to Moses' dicta, were those living in the wilderness now and it was their responsibility to fulfil all the ordinances of God that they might walk in the way of perfect holiness (Dam. Doc. 20:1-2, Ms. B).

There was a second assumption which the Sectaries refused to make even though they believed that they were the redeemable community. While they were convinced that they alone had chosen the way of perfect holiness by obeying God's eternal will, they did not believe that they had earned the right to belong to the covenanted remnant. On the contrary, they were quite aware of their own moral and spiritual imperfections and inadequacies both before they joined the new covenant and after they entered the community. They attributed their election to the eternal covenant almost entirely to God's merciful action toward them. This recognition of their own unworthiness and utter dependence upon God's plan and deeds of mercy and righteousness toward them is especially prominent in the Psalms of Thanksgiving and in the hymnic material contained in their writings. Rarely in the Old Testament does one find such a confession of the unworthiness of men to receive God's pardon as in the following lines:

But I belong to wicked mankind,
to the company of erring flesh;
my iniquities, my transgression, my sin,
with the iniquity of my heart
belong to the company of worms and those who walk in darkness. . . .
In his [God's] mercy he has brought me near,
And in his righteousness he will cleanse me from the impurity
of man,
from the sin of the sons of man.⁶

⁶ Manual of Discipline 11:9-10a, 13b-15 (Burrows' translation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 388).

The same theme recurs in the ceremony of initiation into the Sect when the novitiate confessed the guilt he shared with those of his own generation and of the generations of his forebears (DSD 1:22-2:1). The Sectaries believed that occasionally in ancient times an unusual individual such as Abraham appeared who fully merited God's grace, but the vast majority, including even the twelve sons of Jacob, depended upon God's mercy more than upon his justice for their salvation and upon his remembrance of the covenant made with the ancients (Dam. Doc. 1:4). In Israel's tradition this idea is not unique, for, according to Deuteronomy, Moses had warned the nation against imagining that God had singled out Israel from all the nations of the world because of her uprightness of heart (Deut. 9:4-5). Rather it was because of the wickedness of other nations that God rejected them and because God desired to confirm the word which he swore to the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The Sectaries found further evidence of God's grace in his having allowed even a remnant of this covenanted community to remain after Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of Jerusalem, for the nation had not heeded the prophets' criticism of her attitude of haughty pride in her status as God's elect. In view of God's constant warnings, issued through his servants, the prophets, regarding Israel's misunderstanding of her responsibilities, the Sectaries regarded the continuation of a remnant as proof of God's great love for his people. As the Sectaries viewed their nation's history and saw the elects' inability to perform the requirements of the covenant, they were, therefore, not led to a feeling of self-congratulation nor to a sense of security in thinking of themselves as the ones chosen to fulfil the role of the redeemed remnant. As God had sometimes chosen men in the past who were not worthy to be his sons, so the Sectaries believed that the cause of their own election lay primarily in the nature of God and not in the measure of their own accomplishments. Thus recognizing the long-suffering quality of God's love they responded by confessing their own unworthiness and by determining to fulfil the covenant demands.

Unworthy though they might be to be chosen as God's elect in this last generation of men, they were assured of their status because God continued to reveal his will, his nature, and his mysteries

to them. Since God had illumined their understanding of life, they could designate themselves as the sons of light in conflict with the sons of darkness who followed Belial's leadership rather than God's. To their founder, the Teacher of Righteousness, God had made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants, the prophets. This ability to understand the hidden things in which all Israel had gone astray and to understand how they, on the contrary, might know God's desires continued as a characteristic of the group. The author of the Damascus Document pleaded with the members of the Sect to let him uncover their ears that he might teach them the ways of the wicked and uncover their eyes to see and to understand the works of God. Concerning the wicked, God had made clear that he had never chosen them; he knew their ways from the beginning of creation and would give them their just due throughout all the years of eternity. What God demanded of his elect ones was "to choose what God likes and to reject what he hates, to walk perfectly in all his ways and not to go about with thoughts of a guilty impulse and eyes of fornication."⁷ In fact, knowledge, as the Sectaries associated it with the ideas of revelation and election, penetrated their understanding of life so thoroughly that some scholars, Dupont-Sommer in particular, have raised the question whether this emphasis does not reflect an infiltration of Hellenistic ideas into the thinking of this Jewish sect.⁸

For the educated Greek the world, nature, reality were reasonable rather than miraculous or magical; indeed, they might be said to owe their origin to a rational principle acting upon matter. Man, because he had reason, could understand the world, and to use reason, to know himself, and to act reasonably was his proper function. In his search for the good life, man thus required no outside

⁷ Damascus Document 2:15-16 (Burrows' translation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 350).

⁸ See, in particular, A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Paris, 1952), trans. E. M. Rowley, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford, 1952), pp. 42, 65, n. 1, and, for a discussion of that point of view, see W. D. Davies, "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30," *HTR*, XLVI (1953), 113-39, and Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 252-61.

help; he had reason as his guide. Since the outlook of the Sectaries, and that of the Hebraic tradition generally, differed so completely from this self-assured attitude toward an understanding of life, it would have been impossible for the Sectaries to absorb this outlook into their own developing tradition.

Eventually, however, there developed in the Mediterranean world another approach to the achievement of a higher life, that of Gnosticism. It was pessimistic about human reason but believed that divinely given knowledge could accomplish the desired ends. The gnostic way of thinking comes closer to the Sectaries' outlook, for it spoke of knowledge as a mysterious revelation of truth given to a few for their salvation. In the gnostic systems the initiate believed that he was caught in a conflict between two worlds, that of light and that of darkness, and that a redeemer from the world of light must descend from that world through the heavenly spheres to the world of matter, or of darkness, to deliver the imprisoned soul from the material world and from the evil powers that controlled matter. The gnostic redeemer could give secret and hidden knowledge to the one searching for deliverance and make it possible for him to free himself of bondage to the world of darkness and to find immortality.

Insofar as the Sectaries believed that knowledge of God's mysteries was revealed to the chosen few, they agreed with the Gnostics. But what is more important is that the content of the revelation differed from that of the gnostic schemes. It was at this point that the Sectaries clearly revealed themselves more Jewish than Greek. In their apocalyptic books the Sectaries appear to follow the Gnostics in setting forth the structure of the higher world. But more essential is the doctrine that even this kind of revelation was primarily concerned with the nature of God's will. Instead of learning through revelation about the nature of the cosmos or the relation of man's soul to the cosmos or of deliverance from this earth through mystic illumination and through participation in ritual ceremonies, the Sectaries learned of God's nature and will, as previously revealed through the Law and the Prophets, and how to make that previous revelation relevant to their own situation through inspired interpretation. As Dr. Burrows has pointed out,

knowledge for the Sectaries had "no saving power in itself," nor was it "the immediate vehicle of deliverance" but the means whereby one might know God's demands.⁹ In line with the Hebraic tradition, they stressed, as the Gnostics did not, the ethical requirements in their understanding of revealed knowledge. Through daily willingness and openness to God's instruction, the members of the Sect sought illumination, as had the Servant of Isaiah. In their search for knowledge, then, the guideposts were found within the Hebraic tradition.

In general, therefore, the Sectaries retreated to the solitary regions of the Dead Sea in order that God might bring to fulfilment his promises to the forefathers of the Jewish people and to the prophets regarding the redemption of his covenanted people. As God's enlightened, redeemable, if not redeemed, and eternal remnant, and as his suffering Servant, their effort to co-operate with the will of God in this last generation impelled them to search in the ancient documents of their own tradition for the correct understanding of God's requirements for his remnant. If they could achieve a perfection of holiness, they would lay the foundation of truth for Israel, make atonement for the land, prepare the way for the coming of God, and by their hand God would deliver his judgment upon the nations and upon the wicked among his own people (DSD 5:3-5).

To establish for the Christian community any one single constitutive principle, such as determined the nature of the Qumran Sect, is by no means easy. The Christian group had from the very outset a looser structure, geographically because it was spread over a wider territory and corporately because it had not the same tight organization as the Qumran Sect, with its class demarcations, its regulatory body, and the stages of admission to full membership. At the same time the Church soon developed differences in point of view among its members.

Now it is clear that, like the Qumran Sect, the early Church also believed that its members constituted the community of the elect saints called by God to fulfil the promised role of the remnant in the last days. The designation of themselves as saints, so Paul

⁹ Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 257-60.

pointed out, was never meant to imply that the members of the early Church could boast of their election because they were moral and spiritual heroes. Rather, it connoted a conviction that God had given them an understanding of his very close association with them in a covenant-bond. It was this association with God and not confidence in their own merits which made it possible for the members of the early Church to regard themselves as the community of the redeemed. The early Church of the New Testament period, even within its less tradition-bound groups, was certain that this role was theirs because God's plan for such a community had been announced to men of old and because its fulfilment was now made known to them through special revelation of his will. In general, therefore, certain similarities can be seen between the Qumran Sect and the early Church: for example, the relating of their own religious movement to the tradition of the Old Testament; a sense of unworthiness to fulfil the role planned for them by God; a sense of dependence upon God's grace to bring the plan to realization through them; and the claim of insight, through revelation, into present events as signs of the fulfilment of this plan. The early Church, moreover, used many distinctive terms similar to those found in the Dead Sea Scrolls to express its nature and purpose. It thought of itself as the temple of the living God, the "way," the poor, and the saints.¹⁰

It is understandable that two religious communities emerging from a common religious heritage and compelled, for various reasons, to regard themselves as separatist movements should express an understanding of their distinctive character in terms which came from their common religious heritage. It is also quite possible that the Qumran Sect, as the earlier of these two communities, contributed some of the terminology by which the Church understood its distinctive character. However, there are also notable differences and these are more likely to lead to a proper understanding of the

¹⁰ Burrows is impressed by this similarity of terminology and usage in spite of the common derivation of these concepts from Old Testament documents (*More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York, 1958], p. 112). For a comparative study of the term "way," see *Gotteswege und Menschenwege in der Bibel und in Qumran* by F. Nötscher (Bonn, 1958).

principles constitutive of the Christian community than a mere rehearsal of similarities. To understand the differences it is necessary to begin with the very origins of Christianity, with the mission and message of Jesus himself.

By origin and choice Jesus was identified with a stratum of Jewish society to which the term *am ha-areš* was later applied. The term, meaning "people of the land," had two uses. It was originally used in the plural by Ezra and Nehemiah to refer to the non-Jewish inhabitants of Palestine, that is the pagans. This usage does not concern us here. In the early centuries of our era, it was applied to persons of Jewish race and religion, peasants largely, who could not be trusted to observe the full range of the requirements of the Law. In this sense it stands in contrast to the term Pharisee, applied, as we know, to those who made the full observance of the Law and the regulation of the observance of others their chief aim.¹¹ The fact that full observance, as the Pharisees understood it, required a virtuosity developed only by long and special training made the application of the derogatory term *am ha-areš* to those untrained particularly unfortunate. It denied the fundamental claim of any association with the chosen people and with the hope of redemption to Jews who were prevented from achieving the necessary virtuosity by reasons of occupation, social status, and the mere fact of having to earn a living.

In speaking to and for such people, Jesus took his stand within the tradition of Hebrew prophecy from Amos to Malachi and, like John the Baptist before him, proclaimed the imminent coming of the Kingdom of God. Like John he felt himself divinely commissioned to prepare men for the Day of the Lord, crucial as it was bound to be in its effect on their lives. For the unrepentant and those callously insensitive to their responsibilities toward God, it meant final and complete exclusion from the number of the redeemed. God's wrath would be upon them and those who were surest of their own righteousness might well find themselves among the rejected.

There was another aspect of Jesus' teaching, however, which had

¹¹ See, in general, G. F. Moore, *Judaism* (Cambridge, 1927), I, 60-61; II, 73-74, 157-60.

its origins in Hosea's understanding of God's character. Hosea's interpretation of events in Israel's life led him to the conviction that God dealt with the nation not only in accord with his righteous character. In his opinion the nation had manifested its disloyalty to God from the establishment of the monarchy to his own day. How then could one account for Israel's continued existence during the last two centuries unless God also dealt with Israel in accord with his steadfast love for the nation? This same theme with new variations appears in Jesus' teaching about God's nature. God, according to Jesus, was manifesting his saving will and giving his good gifts, including his Kingdom, to the just and the unjust, to the evil and to the good. In fact, God even went out in search of the lost. To compare God to the shepherd who sought the wandering sheep lost in the rocky crags of the wilderness implied a temporary abandonment of the good, obedient, and non-adventuresome sheep among the flock. Furthermore, to draw the parallel between God and the master of the vineyard who gave equal wages to day laborers regardless of the hours spent in the vineyard meant that Jesus no longer regarded as important the maintenance of a strict balancing of God's mercy and righteousness. Two striking implications appear in his teaching: that the current distinction between just and unjust no longer obtains and that men in no way deserve God's gifts (cf. Luke 17:7-10).

What God demanded of men was that they give themselves to him and to others as he was giving himself and his Kingdom to them. This giving of the self Jesus interpreted as action quite as unconstrained, spontaneous, and complete as God's giving of himself to them. The attitude was one which could not be delineated by the Law or observed within the boundaries of Old Testament prescriptions.

These religious convictions determined the course of Jesus' activities. He conceived of his mission as directed primarily to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, a mission which included the entire nation though some were incapable of realizing their estrangement from God. Those who were aware of this estrangement were the "poor," in the sense in which the term is used in the Psalter, the unfortunate, the meek, the rejected, and the ostracized, that is, pre-

cisely the *‘am ha-areš* insofar as they maintained the elemental loyalties to their religious tradition but felt crushed and deprived of hope for redemption. To them Jesus came with the message that God would give them his Kingdom.

In his search for the "lost" in the towns and villages of Palestine, Jesus came in contact with non-Jews who, so the gospel record indicates, did not come within the scope of his mission as he originally conceived it. However, the implication of his conversations with the Syro-Phoenician woman and the Roman centurion was of great importance for the later Church (Mk. 7:24-30; cf. Matt. 15:21-28 and 8:5-13). In his preaching John the Baptist had already emphasized the importance of the individual's response to God's offer of forgiveness as an element of the process of redemption, but he drew from this no far-reaching conclusions. The children whom God could raise up from stones would still be Abraham's progeny. Jesus in his conversations with the two Gentiles took the implication of salvation for the individual one step further. In fact, to proclaim that the gates of the Kingdom of God were open for the Syro-Phoenician woman and the Roman centurion on the basis of their faith rather than their acceptance of Judaism was a radical and revolutionary change in Jewish thinking. Not only was nationality no guaranty of redemption, but an attitude of receptivity toward the prevenient grace of God was viewed as making salvation possible for non-Jews. Among the followers of Jesus, Paul was the first to sharpen the radical edge of Jesus' insight; he made this view the central issue of the first controversy within the Church (Acts 15 and Gal. 2). Paul preached a gospel which he defined as "the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith, to the Jew first and also to the Greek" (Rom. 1:16). From his day on, the Church refused to regard nationality as a barrier separating men who had become one in Christ.

What has been said about Jesus' message and what we read in the gospels about the crowds that attended him and the multitude that "heard him gladly" (Mk. 12:37) provides the clue to one of the principles constitutive of the community he founded. It is the aggregate of those who respond to the offer of the divine grace and "believe." Seen from this angle and at this stage of its development,

it is quite unorganized and widely distributed, just as it is also not delimited by race or creed. Instead it is the sum total of God's children who humbly accept the offer of the divine forgiveness and respond by taking upon themselves the light "yoke." But there exists still a further principle formative of the Christian community, to which the nature of a special group inside the aggregate of the believers provides the clue.

Alongside the crowds and those who "believe the gospel," the New Testament makes frequent mention of persons known as "disciples." The total number of such disciples was apparently relatively large, but it contained a special nucleus, the Twelve. The group as a whole has two characteristics. The first is that they are "called," though it is not clear whether they were all "called" individually. The "call" of individuals may indeed be limited to the number of the Twelve. The second characteristic is that they "follow" Jesus, though it is not clear that this means literal attendance upon Jesus. Such attendance again may be limited to the number of the Twelve. It is important to note in this connection that what makes a man a disciple is not some formal association, as might exist among the members of a school of philosophers or among the members of a profession. Neither is what makes a man a disciple in the New Testament sense of the word adherence to a body of tradition or concern with a body of material, the mastery of which would permit a disciple eventually to become himself a teacher. Instead, what makes a man a disciple in the gospels is a combination of two things. The first is that he has been "called" by Jesus and acknowledges him as his teacher. The second is that he will pattern his life and actions according to the example of his master, running the whole gamut of his master's experiences including his sufferings (e.g., Mk 8:34). In the larger sense of the word this is what is meant by "following" his master. From this there develops for the disciple a special responsibility, which is that of "witnessing" by his actions and his words what his master proclaims and what his master experiences and does. Everything moves here in the sphere of the most intimate, personal relationship.

From this it would appear that in its most elemental stage the community that came to be called "Christian" had two constitutive

principles. The one was outgoing in character and created an aggregate of believers who received and responded actively to the glad tidings that God would in these last days give the Kingdom to his repentant children. The second was focalizing in character, creating an intimate bond of fellowship and experience between the disciples and Jesus himself and, through the added responsibility of witness, providing for the support and increase of the aggregate of the believers. That even here, at the very beginning, there are fundamental differences between the group called into being by Jesus and the Qumran Sectaries should be obvious.

The Church, in the full sense of the word, came into being only after events and developments transcending the situation as it existed in Jesus' day. The events in question are, of course, the resurrection and the pentecostal experiences. These served to add an important element to the "good tidings," transforming it into the gospel as the Church knew it. They enhanced the basic thesis that the eschatological consummation was at hand, for the Jesus who had been taken up into the clouds would soon return. They enhanced, if that was possible, the importance of Jesus for the group, his resurrection being the vindication of his preaching and the proof of his personal importance, just as the gift of the Spirit, coming from him, was the token of his abiding relation to them. Finally, the experiences enhanced the importance of the responsibility to "witness" and thereby, implicitly, the importance of the disciples and especially the Twelve, for now there was more to witness to and more to look forward to.

It is interesting to note that the period during which the Christian community first began to establish itself at Jerusalem, the very period that saw the content of its belief depart more and more from what was traditional in the Jewish faith, is also the one in which certain similarities between the Church and the Qumran Sect can be detected. This is the juncture at which the use of the term "church" (*ecclesia*) to designate the community of Jesus' disciples seems to begin (Acts 8:1, 9:31), though at a later date its use was read back into the period of Jesus' life (Matt. 16:18, 18:17). In the language of the Jerusalem community, the use of the term may well have meant to identify the community as the *kahal*, the true

"people of Israel" which Moses had led through the wilderness. This is suggested by the direct reference to Deuteronomy 9:10 in Acts 7:38, where the Hebrew term *kahal* is rendered *ecclesia* by the Septuagint version. What this means is that the Church begins to lay claim to being the true Israel, quite as the Qumran Sectarines had been doing. Similarities in other matters such as the establishment of a common treasury by the sale of private property and the communal distribution of food have already been mentioned above. But these attest only the growing inclusiveness of the Church's sense of mission and the fact that, as a locally established organism, the Christian community was in its infancy adopting what patterns it found at hand.

Whatever may be true of the survival at Jerusalem and elsewhere of the traits in the life and thought of the Church that show these similarities, they must be placed in their proper context to be properly appreciated. The very period that saw the Church being established at Jerusalem was also the one which, by enhancing the responsibility of witness, led to the further missionary spread of the faith. Among the disenfranchised in the cities of the Mediterranean basin, this provided for the preservation of the inclusive principle that determined the nature of the Christian community. The very period that saw the Church being established at Jerusalem was also the one in which the disciples were faced with the necessity of formulating the meaning of Jesus' death. Their basic conclusion was that redemption had for them become an accomplished fact, and out of this there eventually developed the idea of the mystical participation in the death and resurrection of Christ as the process by which that redemption was experienced. This provided for the preservation of the focalizing principle that determined the nature of the Christian community. Thus, in spite of ever-changing circumstances and many fluctuations in detail, the nature of the community remained relatively constant and abided by its basic principles.

Analyzed as to their natures, therefore, the Qumran Sect and the early Church stem from the same root, the traditional piety and the national hope of the Jewish people, inherited from the prophetic books of the Old Testament. But each group branched out in its

own way. The Qumran Sect sought, by return to the wilderness and by the most devoted observance, to constitute the redeemed and redeemable remnant that was to inherit the promise. The Christian community was evoked from among those who believed the glad tidings that God's promises were the inheritance of all who responded to them in the Spirit of the divine love and was represented by the fellowship of those who stood in a personal relationship to Jesus as his disciples and witnesses.

CHAPTER THREE

The Leaders of the Communities

The Qumran Sect and the early Church admitted that without their founders and leaders they would have had no clear understanding of their nature and destiny in God's plan of redemption. The power of the founders to attract followers was the dynamic force which had drawn together the fellowships. After each founder's death, his group depended upon leaders to keep the fires of religious zeal and purpose burning. Except for such leadership, the movements would, on the departure of their founders, have disappeared.

Although each religious group felt profoundly indebted to its founder, neither of the two had supplied his followers with the materials for the regulation and maintenance of a continuing community. The documents of the Qumran Sect and of the early Church are the creative attempts of the leaders, rather than of the founders, to mold the character and to guide the life of their respective communities. While the documents do testify to the significance of the work of the founders, that witness is not direct and hence presents difficulties, particularly for a discussion of the founder's sense of vocation and mission. But the leaders, though often anonymous, can be known directly from the materials produced under their direction.

The character of leadership in both groups was determined in part by the types of individuals first drawn into each community. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the documents of the New Testament indicate that the Qumran Sect differed considerably from the early Christian community in this respect.

The situation in which the Qumran Sect had its origin was a conflict between the urban priests of Jerusalem and certain dissenting

rural priests who subsequently settled in the Qumran area. Undoubtedly the initial conflict deepened the historic rift between urban and rural priests so that, as time went on, more and more members of the class living outside of Jerusalem cast their lot with the dissenters in the wilderness. Certainly the documents of the Qumran Sect testify to the predominance of priests within its ranks.¹ Next in importance at Qumran were the Levites, another professional class also associated with the service of the Temple. Only in third place come members of the laity. In its composition, then, the Qumran Sect enjoyed an unusual degree of homogeneity; sharing a common purpose, this homogeneous group developed a well-integrated program for the discipline of the religious life of the community.

The documents of the New Testament, on the other hand, suggest that the Christian community drew its members primarily from persons without professional interest in religious affairs. One finds mentioned such converts as Matthew the toll collector, Peter the fisherman, Simon the tanner, Tabitha the seamstress, Aquila the worker in leather goods, Paul the tentmaker, Erastus a minor city official at Corinth, the Ethiopian eunuch of the treasury office in Ethiopia, and Dionysius the Areopagite, a member of the city council. But one also hears of the conversion of such groups as Galileans, members of the churches of Judea, a portion of John the Baptist's disciples, certain Hellenists, the party of James (Jesus' brother), certain Galatians, inhabitants of Macedonian cities, mixed groups at Corinth and at Ephesus, and the strongly Jewish group at Rome. In general, these individuals and the members of these groups were day laborers, artisans, professional men, small businessmen and petty city officials. They were people of no social importance and, except for such as Paul, Apollos, and Luke the physician, they had little education. Paul quite rightly summed up the character of the early Church by saying that not many wise or noble

¹ According to the Damascus Document, proselytes formed the last of all the classes of people found among the Sectaries. See C. H. Kraeling, *John the Baptist* (New York, 1951), pp. 22-26, for evidence from Josephus and the Talmud on the tensions between the rural and urban priests during this period and later.

had found their way to Christianity but that God had chosen for the Church the simple and the foolish of the world. Some priests (Acts 6:7) and some Pharisees (Acts 15:5), including Paul, were undoubtedly attracted because of the intensity of the Christians' fervor and their exemplary role as the true Israel. But, by and large, the Christian community was gathered from a wide range of individuals who were bound together by the simple, yet complete, dedication of their lives to the purpose of spreading the gospel. It is interesting to note, however, the extent to which, in the Christian community, such persons are associated with prophetic and ecstatic experiences. This may well reflect basic convictions not characteristic of the Qumran group, namely the belief that redemption had already been accomplished and that there continued to exist the possibility of direct personal relation to the founder.

While the Sectaries claimed to be and actually were a democratic group in that all members had equal rights in the group, they nevertheless appointed priests as their leaders, with the Levites acting in close co-operation with the priests. This grouping divided the community into two main sections, those of Aaron and the rest of Israel; in other words, priesthood and laity. Priestly authority was traditional. For, even though the tradition contained elements of confusion regarding some of the details of the relationship of the Levites to the priests, as well as of the claims of various priestly clans for supremacy, the over-all picture presented in the Old Testament made it clear that Aaron, Moses' brother and a member of the tribe of Levi, was the authoritative priest in Israel during the period of desert wandering.² At the end of David's reign and during the reign of Solomon, Zadok was the only legitimate priest in Jerusalem and, according to the Sectaries, was second only to Moses, since he reopened the books of the Law which had been concealed in the ark since Israel's conquest of Canaan in the post-Mosaic era.

² See Num. 16-18, where the division of the people is described as bringing about a separation of the priests and the Levites from the rest of the people. In Deuteronomy the Levites are identical with the priests (Deut. 17:9, 18, 19:1) but in general the Levites were the servants of the priests and were not consecrated to sacred office as were the priests (Num. 18:6-7, Ezek. 44:4-16, Num. 3:5-9).

In their opinion priestly families who were descendants of Aaron or Levi, but not of Zadok, could hold only lesser positions of authority. Maintaining that the legitimate heirs of Zadok's line had renounced the Jerusalem priesthood and found their way into the community at Qumran, the Sectaries could claim that the events of history had placed superior authority with them.

Nor is it difficult to find historical reasons for the Sectaries' exaltation of priests in general. According to ancient tradition, the revelation of God's nature and will had come through dreams, the inspired utterances of the prophets, and the priestly oracles and ritual acts (I Sam. 28:6). Since the Jews believed that prophecy had already ceased in the period prior to the origin of the Sect, two avenues whereby God might reveal himself to men remained: dreams and the ministry of the priests. The first of these means of revelation accounts for the Sect's extensive use and production of apocalyptic literature, which took the form of visions and became a substitute for the prophetic oracle.³ The second accounts for their exaltation of the priesthood. Versed in God's laws, the priest, with his knowledge in particular of the correct moral and ritual responses of men to God's will, served as the instrument whereby the Sectaries might find atonement for their sins and the sins of Israel.

One can find the imprint of the priestly stamp upon every aspect of the Sectaries' communal life. According to their documents, they lived in settlements of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens. Even over the smallest group of ten, a priest was to preside. This priestly rule points to a desire on the part of the Sect to fulfil the suggestions of Moses' father-in-law, a priest of Midian, who had advised Moses to place able, trustworthy, and god-fearing men over each division of the community to judge the people (Ex. 18:21-22). The priests of the Sect had a similar control. It was they who admitted new members into the group, enforced obedience to the community's regulations, presided at religious services and at the meetings for the discussion of ancient scripture, and pronounced the blessings at the sacred meals. Although the inner council, which had final authority in all community affairs, was composed of twelve laymen

³ For a discussion of this feature of Qumran piety, see F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (New York, 1958), esp. pp. 55-56.

and three priests, the priest still held the position of greatest respect and honor (DSD 8:1). Priests saw to it that the rules concerning ritual purity were observed and controlled the common fund of the community, to which each member gave all that he possessed.⁴ Even in their messianic hopes, as will be seen later, the Sectarines gave precedence to the Messiah descended from Levi rather than to the Messiah from the house of David, and in the final great eschatological conflict, according to the War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness, the priests would give the signals for the battle formations.

Because the priestly element was dominant in the Sect, the group as a whole could be thought to perform the priestly function for the nation. The eternal community, which the group claimed to be, was to be the foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron, to be the true witness for justice, to make atonement for the land, to render to the wicked their recompense, to possess eternal knowledge for a covenant of justice, and to offer to God a pleasing fragrance (DSD 8:5-9). Hence each member, under the inspired guidance of God's holy Spirit, must assume a priestly nature and priestly functions. He must make atonement for his own sins and be sanctified so that he might become part of the community which he believed was created to witness to the ideals of justice, to judge the people with equity, and to atone for Israel's sins and make her acceptable to God (DSD 3:6-9). Within the context of their eschatological outlook, this meant that they would be the purified priests who would judge and condemn the godless of Israel and who would serve as priests in the new Temple of the new Jerusalem in the new age.

During the first generation of the early Church (A.D. 30-67) the leaders who most significantly shaped the character of the Christian community were not priests but laymen, who were called apostles.⁵

⁴ The Manual of Discipline 1:21-2:4, 2:20-26, 6:8-9, 9:7-8, 4:2-3, and esp. 9:7-8.

⁵ According to Paul, the apostles merited the rank of first place in his list of church leaders. Luke, in his history of the first generation, reflects the fact that they were the most articulate leaders of the Church in conveying the message of the gospel to those outside the Christian community (see I Cor. 12:28 and the typical sermons in Acts in chapters 2, 3, 10, and 13). While the

What distinguished an apostle of the early Church from those among the Jews and Greeks who applied the term to themselves was that all Christian apostles claimed to be authorized by Christ and that, so authorized, their work was that of witnessing to all peoples. Added to this feeling of authorization was that of compulsion—a compulsion intensified by the conviction that the end of history was imminent. Before it was too late, they must be responsible for the proclamation of the good news of salvation offered to all men.

During the days immediately after Pentecost, the Twelve confined their proclamation of the gospel to all who appeared in the city of Jerusalem. This activity seems to imply that the Christian apostles differed from the Sectaries on two points. While they agreed with the Sectaries that God would establish the center of the new world in Jerusalem, they did not believe that the community they represented would serve as the agent for ushering in the Kingdom. The instrument to be used by God for bringing in his Kingdom would be Jesus, the Messiah and Son of Man, who now sat exalted at God's right hand and would return on clouds of glory at the time of the kingdom's arrival. Nor did the Christian apostles assume that Israel had already condemned herself irrevocably, but rather that it was the Christians' task to convert the Jews and others in Jerusalem to the acceptance of Christ as Lord during the brief period before the Kingdom's coming, after which it would no longer be possible to have a change of heart. Although Jerusalem had been the site of the killing of the prophets and of Jesus, the Messiah, it, and not a wilderness retreat, was the place for the gathering-in of the elect. The Christian apostles conceived of Jerusalem, then, as the main center for the conversion of their Jewish countrymen and of such others as might be found there.

The first leaders of the Church, as scholars have already suggested, did fashion a Christian separatist group which in many respects resembled that of the Qumran Sect.⁶ The members of both

term apostle was common in Greek and Jewish circles, it was not used by the Sectaries.

⁶ See Sherman Johnson, "The Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church," *ZAW*, LXVI (1954), 106-20. In this article Johnson points out

communities, for example, partook daily of a common meal which probably had messianic and eschatological significance. The Christian community, however, still maintained its association with the traditional center of Jewish worship by continuing to go to the Temple. The Jerusalem church, after Pentecost, shared with the Sectaries the conviction that its members possessed the holy Spirit as an unmerited gift indicating God's merciful forgiveness of their past sins and his guidance to eternal truth. For the Sectaries, however, the phenomenon of the possession of the Spirit manifested itself by enlightening them with the significance of ancient Scripture, whereas for the Christian community the possession of the Spirit was a much more turbulent affair, resulting in ecstatic speech and in such deeds of unusual power as healing the sick. Both communities practiced the sharing of property, not as dictated by a social theory, but as motivated by their faith. The Christian community, however, made the sharing of goods a voluntary and not an enforced pooling of wealth. For both groups the sharing of property was an attempt to combat the tendency of men to make the acquisition of wealth their chief aim in life and demonstrated a desire to distribute common funds for the benefit of one's brother in the community. For the early Church, however, the belief that the end of the world was imminent affected its attitude toward property more than it did that of the Sectaries, who thought of the end not in terms of hours or days but of years. Believing that this world would soon give way to the Kingdom of God, the Christian felt that capital would not be of great long-term value and therefore did not manage common property as carefully as did the Sectaries. The Church's experiment in a kind of communal life proved so disastrous that Paul endeavored to collect funds from the Gentile churches to support the impoverished mother church at Jerusalem.

The problem faced by the apostles regarding the just distribution of common goods brought about the development of a group within

some of the more obvious similarities, without sufficiently considering similarity and dissimilarity of points of view. He has indicated that in both groups severe measures were taken against lying about goods contributed by members of the community (Acts 5:4; cf. DSD 6:25) and on the sharing of goods (see Acts 2:44-45, 4:34-37).

the Church known as Hellenists. The importance of this for the comparative study of the two religious communities does not lie in the possibility, as some scholars have suggested, that the addition of this new administrative group to the organized leadership of the Church is similar to the Sectaries' executive council of fifteen. Since the Sectaries' council was made up of twelve laymen and three priests, in contrast to the Christians' less cohesive group of twelve apostles and seven administrators of a relief program, the character and purpose of the leaders in the two communities differed too widely to warrant a valid comparison. What is more significant about the new group of Hellenists, as Cullmann has indicated, is the possibility that they might have been the link whereby Qumran beliefs and practices were communicated to the Gentile branch of the early Church.⁷

Cullmann makes this suggestion on the basis of the similarity of experiences shared by the Sectaries and the Christian Hellenists and of the effects which these experiences had upon their outlook. The Hellenists fled from Jerusalem because of persecution whereas the law-abiding Jewish Christians were permitted to remain. As a consequence the Hellenists, like the Sectaries, had to abandon the Temple. What is important in these developments among the Hellenists is reflected in a sermon attributed to Stephen. According to Acts, the Hellenist leader Stephen argued on the basis of Scripture that God had rejected the community of the old covenant because it did not understand the significance of the promises made to Abraham, the ordinances given to Moses, or the place where God was to be worshiped. The speech closes by saying that God does not need to be worshiped in a man-made dwelling, for a prophet of former days had said that heaven was God's throne and earth his footstool. Thus Stephen, as a representative preacher of the Hellenist group, expressed a judgment upon the members of the old covenant and an assurance that his own religious group had been chosen to take their place. The outlook expressed here is reminiscent of similar ideas circulating among the Sectaries. The Hellenists' rejection of the Temple at Jerusalem, however, was more drastic than that of

⁷ O. Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," *JBL*, LXXIV (1955), 213-26.

the Sectaries, for the Hellenists came to regard Christ, the dwelling place of God's glory, as the substitute for the Temple, while the Sectaries continued to regard the Temple as the sacred dwelling place of God for the new age. Since in their day it had been too much polluted by the wicked priests to serve such a purpose, they regarded their own community as the temporary dwelling place of God. But after the purification of the Jerusalem Temple in the new age, God would return to the Temple where the Sectaries would serve as its righteous priests.

The refugee leaders of the Hellenist group within the Church did not consider persecution an overwhelming disaster but a divinely ordained occasion for extending their witness to the gospel. As Philip and other Hellenists, including Paul, worked north to the regions of Syria and Anatolia and eventually westward as far as Rome, the question of the organization and the leadership of the Church took on new dimensions. The problem was, what were the criteria for admission to membership in the Church? This in turn posed the question, what was the nature of Christianity? Was it to continue as a Jewish separatist group or to become a completely new religious organization without roots in the past, or was it to be a religious movement separate from Judaism and yet related to it in some way? As time went on and the leaders of the various groups in the Church developed their own views regarding the meaning of the Christian gospel, the Christian community found itself split into three main divisions. The first of these was the conservative group under the leadership of James, Jesus' brother, which remained at Jerusalem and was famous for its adherence to Jewish observantism and piety. During the Jewish revolt this group fled to Pella, where it disappears from view. The second was a liberal group under the aegis of the Hellenists led by Stephen, which eventually included Philip and Paul and his helpers, and which took the Christian gospel to the main centers of the Roman Empire. A third group, associated with Peter and eventually including also Barnabas, seems to have occupied a mediating position. Each had its own formulas for admission to the community and each its own proper interpretation of the nature of the Christian faith. The outcome of the struggle, in which the liberal wing carried off most of the

laurels, is well known and does not concern us here. But it did have its effect on the question of leadership and this requires consideration.

In the Jerusalem phase of the development of the early Church, the Twelve were the dominant leader group, owing their position to the fact that they had been "called" by Jesus, had been the associates of his public ministry, and had become witnesses of his resurrection and recipients of the Spirit at Pentecost. The unique position of the Twelve was called into question by the development of the liberal group, not intentionally, it would seem, but by force of circumstance. As the original Hellenists and Paul after them began to "witness," their witness found acceptance and the fact of the matter was that communities of believers came to exist without benefit of the Twelve and among those who were non-Jews and did not observe the requirements of the Law. To account for this fact, an adjustment in the concept of apostleship was necessary.

Paul in his letters admitted that he was unworthy to be called an apostle because he had once persecuted the Church, but he was obviously at great pains to establish his claim to apostolic authority, and that precisely on the basis of the traditional criteria. He regarded his vision on the Damascus road as making him a witness of the resurrected Christ on equal terms with the Twelve (I Cor. 15:8-10). He makes a mysterious conditional reference to having known Christ "after the flesh" (II Cor. 5:16). He is conscious of having shared Christ's sufferings (II Cor. 1:5) and everywhere insists that he has been "called." But it is clear that Paul's apostolic status was questioned (I Cor. 9:2), and there were others like him who did not have the same possibility of claiming equality with the Twelve along traditional lines.

It is clear that the issue was resolved, perhaps again by force of circumstance. What came of the conflict was the establishment of a new criterion of leadership. Leadership was conferred by virtue of a divine gift, the gift of a certain endowment to the candidate. The endowment was spiritual in nature and took diverse forms, some being endowed for one function in the Church and some for another, as the Spirit chose (I Cor. 12:4-31). In terms of the administration of Church life, the gift came to be thought of as being

conferred by the "laying on of hands." This was probably not a part of the original conception, but it helped to connect the old order and the new on the assumption that the Spirit was conferred by the agency of those already endowed with it, and this usage was projected back into the earliest days of the Church at Jerusalem (Acts 6:6).

The development of what is known as the "charismatic" concept of the ministry or leadership was of the utmost importance for the Church. It brought to an end the hegemony of the Twelve long before they would have disappeared from the scene in the normal course of events. Thus it ruled out the creation of a caliphate, a type of organization in which leadership would eventually have passed to such as were deemed in closest succession to Jesus. The conservative wing of the early Church, which did not go along with the new developments, did actually end up with this type of leadership, in which cousins of Jesus succeeded James "the brother of the Lord." In the Church generally, however, the doors had been thrown wide open for the creation of a new leadership sanctioned by factors other than historical priority or inheritance.

The development is of the utmost importance also for the comparison of the leadership in the early Church and the Qumran Sect. Not only was the leadership of the Church not recruited from a special class, it was not recruited on the basis of any external criteria whatsoever, whether of race, age, length of association with the community, or passage through a succession of offices. How different this made the leadership in the two groups should be obvious. But while this difference results largely from a chain of events, too much emphasis should not be laid on the secondary nature of the later Christian leadership. In a very real sense the new leaders in the Church were, or at least claimed to be, associated with Jesus himself. True, the grace of God was the basis upon which their charismatic endowment was, like all else, obtained, but the Spirit with which the leaders were endowed was still fundamentally, at least for Paul, the Spirit of Christ himself. Thus the leaders were the appointees of the same Lord as the Twelve and had the same function as the Twelve, to run the gamut of their Lord's experiences and to witness to him. True, Jesus himself had chosen only Jews

when he created the inner circle of his disciples, but his choice had not been based on external criteria either, whether length of association with the larger circle of followers or the acquisition of skills by years of humbler service. Moreover, the inclusion of Judas Iscariot in the group of the Twelve, if indeed his meager potentialities were recognizable so early, can be understood only on the assumption that Jesus sought to make the group a cross-section of the nation it was in part supposed to typify. The differences between the Qumran leadership and that of the developing Church are therefore partly cumulative and partly fundamental.

The leaders of the Christian community came to include not only apostles but also prophets and teachers. This is the unanimous testimony of Acts (13:1), of Paul (I Cor. 12:28), and of the Didache (chap. 11, the author himself being presumably a teacher).

Contrary to the position maintained by rabbinic Judaism that prophecy had ceased in the days of Malachi and would not be re-born until the messianic era, the Sectaries and Christians believed that members of their groups had prophetic gifts.⁸ According to Josephus the Sectaries studied the prophetic oracles of the Old Testament so that they might gain insight into the future. He also states that they made remarkably accurate predictions regarding events to take place in the near future. To illustrate their prophetic powers Josephus makes reference to a certain Judas, a teacher of the Sect, who foretold the death of Antigonus, and to events in the lives of Herod the Great and of his son Archelaus.⁹ By assigning to Christian prophets a rank of importance second only to that of the apostles and by referring frequently to their activities, the authors of the New Testament documents testify to the significance of the prophets in the life of their community. Luke tells of Christian prophets coming from Jerusalem to Antioch who predicted a famine (Acts 11:27) and of Agabus, a prophet of Judea, who foretold Paul's

⁸ As early as I Maccabees certain problems were left unsolved until the coming of a prophet (I Macc. 4:46, 9:27).

⁹ *Ant.* XIII, 11, 2; XV, 10, 5; XVII, 13, 3. Further proof of the revival of prophecy in this era is Josephus' reference to the Egyptian Jew who claimed to be a prophet in the days of Felix when Paul was taken captive (*Ant.* XX, 8, 6; cf. Acts 21:38).

imprisonment (Acts 21:10). Paul, though he cautioned the Church against the chaos in Christian meetings created by overly enthusiastic prophets unable to wait their turn to utter oracular pronouncements, upheld the importance of prophets as men endowed with spiritual gifts (I Cor. 12-14). By calling himself a prophet, the author of the Book of Revelation has placed himself within the ranks of apocalyptic visionaries who regarded themselves as the continuers of the historic role of the prophet. The existence of an apocalyptic literature within the Qumran Sect and the early Church and the importance which the eschatological views expressed in such documents had for the general outlook of both communities indicate the influence of the prophetic leaders upon the two religious movements.

Whether or not the type of prophetic activity taking place within the Qumran Sect made an impact upon the early Church is difficult to determine. It is interesting to note, however, that the contributions of Qumran and Christian prophets to their own religious movements were quite similar. In the case of both communities the revival of prophecy occurred under conditions of severe duress and when the lives of the members were in jeopardy. Under such circumstances faith is the means of triumph over adversity, and prophecy is the instrument by which faith outruns the difficulties and visualizes their conquest with God's help. The importance of the revival of prophecy, therefore, lies not so much in the description of the world to come as in the belief that God is now fulfilling the promises made to the prophets of old by pouring out his Spirit upon men who would see visions and dream dreams. The revival of prophecy in apocalyptic form stressed in particular the belief that the last days of the world's history had arrived.

While it is true that both communities associated the revival of prophecy with the new age, it is precisely within the range of these eschatological ideas that one notices a significant difference between the two communities. According to the Manual of Discipline, the Sectaries were to keep the laws of Moses until the appearance of the Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel (DSD 9:8-11). The reference is to the particular figure whose coming had been prophesied by Moses (Deut. 18:15-16). This same figure is alluded to in

the speech of Peter in Acts 3:22–26 and in the Fourth Gospel, where John the Baptist denies that he is “the Prophet” (Jn. 1:21) and where the people who have witnessed the Multiplication of the Loaves say of Jesus, “This is indeed the Prophet who is to come into the world” (Jn. 6:14).¹⁰ Though both groups had a common interest in the rebirth of prophecy, the Sectaries still looked forward to the advent of the Prophet, whereas the early Church maintained that he had already appeared in the person of Jesus.

The difference between the two groups can also be seen in the identity of the persons to whom the prophetic utterances recorded in the literature of the two communities are attributed. The authors of apocalyptic documents from Qumran attribute their revelations of the future to men of the distant past—to Enoch, to Levi, and to Moses; the Christian prophets of the New Testament period associate their revelations with Jesus himself. Thus the author of the Book of Revelation describes his work as “The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him to show to his servant John, who bore witness to the word of God and to the testimony of Jesus Christ” (Rev. 1:1–2). In the gospels the evangelists made this association even closer by attributing certain prophetic words, which were obviously created by the Church since they reflect the outlook of the early Church and not of Jesus, to Jesus himself. An example of this procedure can be found in the apocalyptic discourse attributed to Jesus in Mark 13 with its two divergent sets of eschatological ideas. No statement in the Qumran documents claims that the founder of the Sect was a prophet, as the synoptic evangelists claimed Jesus to have been, or the messianic Prophet, as the author of the Fourth Gospel maintained. It seems likely, therefore, that the prophetic type of leadership had greater importance for the Church than for the Sectaries, since Christian prophets could associate their work with

¹⁰ The Fourth Evangelist views the people’s interest in the Prophet as noteworthy because it is part of the larger picture that makes Jesus the fulfilment of every eschatological hope. On this point see F. Young, “Jesus the Prophet: Re-examination,” *JBL*, LXVII (1948), 285–99. But those who confess Jesus as the Prophet base their faith on miracles, and such faith is in his eyes of a lower order than that of those who know him as the “bread of life.”

that of their founder, which might be regarded as prophetic in either the Old Testament or the messianic sense.

The third type of leadership provided by these two religious movements for their members was in the sphere of teaching. The title "teacher" was commonly applied by Jewish students to their own Pharisaic teachers, or "rabbis." It was also used by the disciples of Jesus and the Sectaries. In the case of the Sectaries, the right to the use of the title belonged exclusively to the teacher par excellence, the Teacher of Righteousness, or Righteous Teacher. It was not applied to the priests whose function it was to explain what was implied in the instructions of that Teacher. For his disciples Jesus was also the teacher par excellence as long as he lived. If the early Church felt free to assign the title to certain Christians gifted in teaching, this was because, after Easter, Jesus' authority as the revealer of God's will transcended the limitations of the term "teacher." Conversely, it appears likely that the Sectaries continued to use the title for their Teacher even after his death because in their experience their founder never passed beyond the relationship of a teacher to the group and because this title continued to be useful for describing the nature of that relationship.

While the Sectaries did not attribute the title "teacher" to their instructing priests, these men performed the same function for the Sect as the Christian teachers did for their communities, particularly those Christian teachers working in the Palestinian environment. Both the instructing priests of the Sectaries and the early Christian teachers taught their pupils the differences between the way of righteousness and the way of wickedness. From this there grew in the early Church the catechism of the Two Ways (Didache I-VI). The materials used for instruction were the ethical teachings and the sententious sayings of the Old Testament as well as the teachings of the respective founders. Comparison of the Manual of Discipline and the Didache shows a surprising similarity of subject matter in the instruction on the Two Ways: the regulations for officials of the organization and the celebration of sacred rites, for example. The similarity between the instructional material of the Palestinian church and that of the Sect is even more pronounced when compared to the type of didactic instruction presented by

Christian teachers living in a Gentile environment. The Palestinian church, like the Qumran Sect, formulated man's ethical responsibilities in terms of concrete practical injunctions, but Gentile Christianity sometimes adopted a more abstract approach to ethical problems, tending to imitate the ethic of the Stoic philosophers.¹¹

A few significant conclusions may be drawn from the comparison of the roles played by Qumran and Christian leaders in their respective communities. The dominance of priestly authority was characteristic of Qumran leadership. Priestly administrators and priestly instructors controlled the life of the Qumran community entirely. In the Christian community, on the other hand, the several types of leaders represent no one single professional class. Moreover, there was a greater diversity of tasks, for the apostle was to present the gospel message to those who had never heard it, the teacher was to instruct converts in the Christian way of life, and the prophet was to disclose to the Church new insights as revealed to him through the inspiration of the holy Spirit. Finally, the shift from a Palestinian environment to that of the Greco-Roman world demanded of the Christian leaders changes in the forms of communications. This made for variety and for enrichment in the expression of leadership. In the Qumran Sect, which remained in one locale, leadership tended to have a static character.

In the development of Christian leadership, one further change should be noted. Sometime before the end of the first century of our era, it would seem, the itinerant apostle, who had traveled from one local church to another and provided a bond of unity for the whole Church, disappeared. In his stead individual churches began to appoint resident local leaders. The first of these local leaders may not have been men of great consequence, but by the beginning of the second century the local churches were producing vivid and forceful leaders, many of whom are known to us by name. Such were Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp of Smyrna, the Elder John of Ephesus, and Clement of Rome. With their emergence the term

¹¹ The contrast in instructional materials and methods is to be found in the collections of Jesus' sayings, the epistle of James, and the Didache on the one hand, and, on the other, in the catalogues of vices and virtues listed by Paul in his letters.

"apostle" ceases to be used for the highest of the Christian leaders and the title "bishop" takes its place. During the apostolic age the term had been applied to members of groups intrusted with administrative responsibility for the day-to-day affairs of local churches (Phil. 1:1). The Qumran Sectaries had an inspector or overseer also, in whose hands rested the administration of the practical affairs of communal living.¹² Such men were extremely useful under all circumstances. In the early Church it was only as the charismatically endowed apostles and prophets disappeared from the scene that one individual bishop came to the fore locally, to take over leadership in all its several aspects. This included the conduct of worship, the celebration of the sacraments, and the maintenance of traditional beliefs. For, as time went on, regularity in faith and order became more and more the earmarks and the sources of strength of the Christian community.

With the emergence of the monarchic episcopate, the differences between the early Church and the Qumran Sectaries in matters of leadership become most sharply defined. This is in large measure the result of a long process of development, as we have seen, from which the Qumran group in its isolation was apparently exempt. Yet the new leadership in the Church reflects at least the principle of complete freedom of choice among individuals of the most varied background and competence that was operative in Jesus' selection of the Twelve. Some of the differences, therefore, are fundamental and abiding.

¹² For a discussion of this important functionary in the Sect, see Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, pp. 175-76.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Founders of the Communities

Historically the Qumran Sect and the Christian community are religious groups that rest upon and are determined by the person and work of founders. Without their founders they would never have come into being. Nothing could, therefore, be of greater importance for the understanding of the two movements than a clear conception of the two personages in question. But there are enormous difficulties in the way of the accomplishment of this objective.

Neither of the two founders has left us direct evidence of himself. We are in both cases dependent upon the testimony of others about them. This testimony, moreover, is relatively scanty. That is particularly true of the Teacher of Righteousness, whose figure, for reasons already outlined above, never gave rise to the kind of semi-biographical documents that we know as gospels and who in fact remains unknown to us by name.¹ What information about him exists comes to us incidentally, in the context of writings that serve other than biographical or semibiographical purposes. In the case

¹ For a summary of recent discussion on the identification of the Teacher of Righteousness, see Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York, 1958), pp. 204-18. Cross maintains that the Qumran founder, designated as the Righteous Teacher in the Scrolls, was probably a "Zadokite priest of Hasidic sympathies" who began his work at the end of Jonathan's reign (160-142 B.C.) or during the early years of Simon's reign (142-134 B.C.). See *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (New York, 1958), esp. p. 101, and, for his discussion of the historical situation of Qumran origins, pp. 95-119. Dupont-Sommer has recently stated that the identification of the Teacher is not a matter of first importance but that his role as prophet, man of sorrows, and head of the "Church" is significant (A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les Écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* [Paris, 1959], pp. 370-79).

of Jesus the situation is, of course, somewhat better, but the gospels often leave us short of the kind of knowledge most useful for the appraisal of personality, the kind that reveals the subjective factor and makes it possible to follow development. Finally, the quest for an understanding of the founders leads inevitably into the realm of vocational consciousness, which, in the sphere of religion, is always most difficult to appraise.²

The topic under consideration here is given particular importance by the thesis of Dupont-Sommer that the founder of the Qumran Sect anticipated in a very real sense the experiences of Jesus and the claims made for Jesus by his followers.³ He is said to have been the prototype upon which the whole Christian conception of Jesus as the Messiah—who suffered, rose from the dead, and will return—was based. As a religion of redemption Christianity would, on this suggestion, be only the pale imitation of the Qumran Sect, created by the transfer to Jesus of beliefs originating elsewhere. The hypothesis recalls, of course, the efforts made in the earlier years of this century to derive what the early Church said about Jesus from the dying and rising saviors of the mystery cults, and those made at the end of the last century referring back to supposed astral myths of Babylonia. But even so, New Testament criticism cannot afford to pass the new challenge by unheeded.

What is known about the Teacher of Righteousness comes largely from the Damascus Document, the Habakkuk Commentary, and the Psalms of Thanksgiving, which, as some suggest, may have been written by the Teacher himself and thus may express his personal view of his place in God's plan.⁴ According to the Damascus

² The interpretations of Jesus' vocational consciousness range from J. Klausner's view that Jesus had delusions of grandeur (*Jesus of Nazareth* [New York, 1929], esp. pp. 253–57) to H. J. Cadbury's view that Jesus' career was unorganized, episodic, and not to be comprehended within a single purpose (*The Peril of Modernizing Jesus* [New York, 1937] pp. 130–38).

³ See Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux Aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Paris, 1953), trans. R. D. Barnett, as *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes* (London, 1954), pp. 51–57.

⁴ For a survey of recent discussion on these psalms, see Burrows, *More Light*, pp. 324–30.

Document, after a series of disasters suffered by Israel, the last of which was Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of Jerusalem, a small band of men recognizing their guilt, yet groping for true enlightenment in their search for God's way, found a man whom God had raised up to lead them, the Teacher of Righteousness. For twenty years they had looked blindly for the right path. Then God recognized their need for guidance and placed in their midst a Teacher to reveal to them what God had intended them to be (Dam. Doc. 1: 5-12; cf. 6:11, 20:1). On the positive side the coming of the Teacher of Righteousness was therefore interpreted as a part of the divine plan and he was himself a divinely chosen instrument for the accomplishment by God of his redemptive purposes. On the negative side he clarified for his followers the true character of the "congregation of treacherous men" and defined the issues which brought about the decisive cleavage between the Sect and the rest of Israel. On the one side were the sons of darkness inspired by Belial, the prince of evil powers. On the other were the sons of light, the members of the Sect who longed for God's truth.

The Teacher's peculiar endowment was the ability to understand the hidden and mysterious sense of the prophetic books of the Old Testament and of the Law of Moses. The writer of the Habakkuk Commentary clearly describes this aspect of the Teacher's vocation in the following quotation:

God told Habakkuk to write the things that were to come upon the last generation, but the consummation of the period he did not make known to him. And as for what it says, "that he may run who reads it," this means the teacher of righteousness, to whom God made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets.⁵

For his followers the significance of this particular ability of the Teacher was not merely that they should try to imitate his method but that they should believe in him because of what he taught by his exegetical interpretation of Scripture. Commenting upon a passage famous because of its use also by New Testament writers, the

⁵ Habakkuk Commentary 7:1-6 (Burrows' translation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York, 1955], pp. 366-67).

author of the Habakkuk Commentary claimed that, when Habakkuk said "the righteous shall live by faith," he meant that God would rescue from persecution all the Teacher's followers because they believed in their Teacher and labored to follow his instructions in the Law (DSH 8:1-3). The rest of the congregation of Israel acting under the guidance of the "man of lies" did not believe when they heard

all things that are coming upon the last generation from the mouth of the priest [i.e., the Teacher of Righteousness] into whose heart God put wisdom to explain all the words of his servants the prophets, through whom God declared all things that are coming upon his people and his congregation.⁶

Furthermore, according to the Damascus Document, if any member of the Sect found it impossible to adhere to the founder's teaching, he could no longer look forward with hope to the coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel and would find that his name had been omitted from the book of life (Dam. Doc. 7:20-21). By his rejection of the Teacher and his instruction, he would suffer the same lot as those who had never believed in him and in his words.

The stand taken by the priest-teacher, as the shepherd of his scattered flock, brought him into violent conflict with the wicked priests and the man of lies. The theme of this hostility is one of central importance, running throughout the Habakkuk Commentary where several crucial passages bear upon it. In its present state of preservation the Commentary opens with a clear statement on the subject. Here it is said that the wicked man (i.e., the Wicked Priest) "encompasses the righteous man" (i.e., the Teacher of Righteousness) because the law is slack in enforcing justice. The related statement in column 11 of the Commentary is the one that has led Dupont-Sommer to believe that the Teacher suffered persecution by being "uncovered" (i.e., stripped of his clothes before execution) and that he appeared in risen and glorious form after death to execute just vengeance upon his persecutor, the Wicked Priest. Here then, according to Dupont-Sommer, one finds evidence for a dying and rising messianic leader. The passage is worth quoting in full:

⁶ Habakkuk Commentary 2:6-9 (Burrows' translation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 365).

"Woe to him who makes his neighbors drink, who pours out his wrath; yea, he has made them drunk; to gaze on their festivals." This means the wicked priest, who persecuted the teacher of righteousness in order to confound him in the indignation of his wrath, wishing to banish him; and at the time of their festival of rest, the day of atonement, he appeared to them to confound them and to make them stumble on the day of fasting, their Sabbath of rest.

"You are sated with ignominy instead of glory. Drink, you yourself, and stagger! The cup in the LORD's right hand will come around to you, and shame will come upon your glory!" This means the priest whose ignominy was greater than his glory, because he did not circumcise the foreskin of his heart, but walked in the ways of drunkenness, that this thirst might be removed. But the cup of wrath of God will confound him, increasing his confusion. And the pain. . . .⁷

Discussion of the passage involves two things: the translation of the original text; and the context within which the passage is found. In rendering the text, Dupont-Sommer translates "banish" as "uncover" and interprets "appeared to them" as a resurrection appearance, inferring from this that the Teacher had been executed by his enemies after having been stripped. The best discussion of this interpretation is that of Burrows, who maintains that the text does not state definitely that the Teacher was killed, that there seems to be no reason to change the subject of the verbs in this passage so as to make the Teacher rather than the Wicked Priest perform the act of appearing, and that there is no evidence for making the verb "appear" refer to an epiphany of a divine being.⁸ In fact, in the Damascus Document when the death of the Teacher is mentioned the writer does not refer to the reappearance of the Teacher nor associate with him the inauguration of the messianic age and judgment upon the wicked (Dam. Doc. 8:21, 20:1). Rather the author thinks of the Teacher as one who belongs to this order of things, an order that requires the keeping of the Law. This order

⁷ Habakkuk Commentary 11 (Burrows' translation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 369-70).

⁸ See Burrows' argument against Dupont-Sommer's suggestion in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 150-56.

must be maintained until the Messiahs of Aaron and of Israel shall appear to establish a new order in which the restrictions of the Law are no longer valid.

Dupont-Sommer tries to find support for his thesis in certain pseudepigraphic documents which he believes the Sect may have produced. Such documents, he claims, are the familiar Book of Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, the Testament of Levi, and the Martyrdom of Isaiah. They are relevant to his argument because they speak of people being taken up to heaven. But the argument is not cogent. In the first place, most of these documents have not been found as yet among the fragments discovered in the Qumran caves, not even the important section in the Book of Enoch which tells of Enoch's assumption (En. 37-71, esp. 70-71). Second, while the idea of assumption to heaven may well have been in circulation in other Jewish circles, or even within that of the Sectaries, there is no conclusive evidence in these documents to support the idea that a dying-rising messianic figure was derived from an actual experience of such a figure in the life of the Qumran community. If the Sect had had an experience of the assumption and return of their Teacher of Righteousness on clouds of glory, it would seem likely that the event would have left its mark on almost every page of its literature.

Assuming that Dupont-Sommer is correct in suggesting that the Teacher has appeared in glory to his persecutors to avenge himself against the Wicked Priest, it seems strange that the Wicked Priest should continue, as the end of column 11 and column 12 of the Habakkuk Commentary indicate, in his persecution of the Teacher's followers. The Teacher's vengeance did not halt the Wicked Priest from engaging in acts of violence against the cities of Judah and in plundering the possessions of the poor, the doers of the Law in Judah. In fact, the context clearly states that the Wicked Priest has not yet received his just recompense but will when God himself comes in judgment. It seems doubtful, therefore, that the passage can be interpreted as an anticipation of the kind of messianic hope which the early Church found fulfilled in Jesus.

Although the Sectaries had never encountered their Teacher in a risen form of glory, their conviction that they must do more than

believe in his words had not been invalidated thereby. They felt impelled to believe in him, that is, to have a personal faith in what he, as a person, could do for their salvation. Before Paul had given a Christian interpretation of the passage in Habakkuk (2:4—"the righteous shall live by their faithfulness"), the Sectaries had already similarly adapted it by interpreting it to mean that salvation was not to be gained by faithful devotion to the Law only, but that it required also faith in and utter dependence upon the person of their founder.

The basis for this attitude toward the Teacher can be traced in the Psalms of Thanksgiving, which may originally have been written by the Teacher of Righteousness himself.⁹ In these psalms the author regards himself as the person through whom God has given his enlightening knowledge and truth to his followers, and as the instrument through which God has fought against the interpreters of lies. By listening to him, his followers have united themselves with him in God's covenant, and, by deciding to walk in the ways of the covenant and of the laws revealed to their leader, they believe that they will be justified on the day of judgment and can expect a glorious reward in the assembly of the celestial host. The author of these psalms believes that he has rightfully assumed the position of an authoritative leader for the Sect. He feels that God has granted him the undeserved benefits of divine love and forgiveness and has enabled him to understand with unusual clarity the divine will and purpose at work in the world. Knowledge gained through the vision of God has turned him from the way of the prophets of untruth, who followed Belial, to the way of eternal light.

The personal expressions of petition and thanksgiving in these psalms have much to contribute to the topic under discussion here. If they are the work of the Teacher of Righteousness, they reflect directly his high sense of calling, a calling that gives him a position second to none among the recipients of God's self-revelation and in the final clash between the powers of light and darkness. If they are the product of the Sect, they reflect not only the veneration in which the Teacher was held, but also the ability of someone in the Sect so to identify himself with the Teacher as to be able to conjure

⁹ See Burrows, *More Light*, pp. 324-30.

up the image of him speaking. Such identification of oneself with another, like that of Paul with Christ, bespeaks as one of its sources an historical figure supremely able to impress itself upon followers, and hence a person of great power and self-assurance.

Turning now to the founder of the Christian community, it will be obvious that the entire body of the early Christian literature, our source material, is in agreement on one point. It is that Jesus was and fulfilled in himself the role of the promised Messiah of God. That Jesus had in fact a high vocational consciousness can scarcely be doubted, for he became the founder of the Church. The question is rather whether his sense of mission was identical in all respects with that which the Church concordantly assigned to him. Several peculiarities of gospel tradition have given rise to doubts on this score. There is, for instance, a great difference between the Fourth Gospel and the other three in the portrayal of Jesus. For the writer of the Fourth Gospel, it was Jesus' function to call attention to himself and to demand faith in himself as the final and complete revelation of God. In the Synoptic Gospels Jesus' teaching was much more objective and placed the main emphasis not on himself but on the Kingdom of God. In these gospels the writers can have Jesus say: "Why do you call me good? No one is good but God alone" (Mk. 10:18). Another peculiarity of gospel record is that it makes Jesus use both the messianic title "Son of Man" and the term "prophet" for himself. The difference between "prophet" and "Son of Man" may not seem great today. But for the people of Jesus' day the two terms were poles apart in meaning, for the term "prophet" marked the individual as a divinely inspired spokesman of God while the term "Son of Man" referred to a messianic figure of transcendental and divine character. The application of both terms to Jesus by the evangelists demands an explanation.

The best way to proceed in these matters is to begin with the evangelists' potentially minimal claim for the significance of Jesus' person and work. In their opinion, his teaching and action certainly distinguished him from the rabbis of the day. He did not maintain a school or concern himself with *halakah* (juristic exegesis). Instead he reacted to the contemporary situation and addressed his message to the unfortunate with a prophetic sense of divine authorization.

The contrast finds its counterpart in an earlier era of Israel's history, for there is a similar difference between the pronouncements of the prophets of the Old Testament and the laws of the priestly writers or the aphorisms of the sages. As the prophets before him had made pronouncements and declarations proclaiming the will of God, so Jesus too spoke with a sense of authorization. There is a factual difference between Jesus and the rabbis here that represents a different sense of vocation. Interpreting gospel record on this minimal level, Bultmann and others conclude that Jesus "spoke as a messianic prophet" and regarded himself as an "eschatological prophet."¹⁰ In other words, Jesus' proclamation concerned the imminent end of the present age and the inauguration of the new age through the work of God's messianic agent, but as a prophet Jesus did not identify himself with this messianic figure.

Since the confession of Jesus as the Messiah dominated the evangelists' faith and probably that of the entire Church of the post-Easter period, the references in the gospels to the prophetic character of Jesus' ministry undoubtedly had their origin in Jesus' own thought.¹¹ But there are certain details of the gospel record which indicate that Jesus went beyond this understanding of his role in the contemporary scene.¹² While he identified himself and his work with John the Baptist and John's prophetic task, it seems likely that, at some time in his career, Jesus came to think of God as requiring of him something more than the work of a prophet. One intimation of such a higher sense of vocation is to be found in

¹⁰ R. Bultmann, *Jesus* (Berlin, 1926), trans. L. P. Smith and E. Huntress, as *Jesus and the Word* (New York, 1934), pp. 124-25.

¹¹ In his speech given in Solomon's porch of the Jerusalem Temple, Peter does not compare Jesus with the prophets of the Old Testament but with a particular prophet, the one whose coming had been prophesied by Moses (Acts 3:22). See above, pp. 73-74.

¹² Any attempt to go beyond the minimum in dealing with the vocational consciousness of Jesus is fraught with the dangers described by H. J. Cadbury, *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus* (New York, 1937). The effort made here to argue from the implications of Jesus' sayings on John the Baptist would seem to provide a greater assurance of escape from pure subjectivity than those starting from the assumptions of the dialectical theology.

a saying of Jesus that critics generally regard as characteristic of his thought. This is his statement, "If it is by the finger [or Spirit] of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you" (Luke 11:20; cf. Matt. 12:28). The importance of this is apparent when Jesus' work is seen as a sequel to John's mission and message. For Jesus the power to heal men of their diseases was not in itself particularly remarkable, for others were also exorcising demons and performing cures (Matt. 12:27). But it was significant for him that, as John's successor, he could do what John had not been empowered to do, namely, perform mighty works. At the outset of his own career Jesus had used as the theme of his prophetic proclamation the words of John, "Repent for the kingdom of God is at hand." In Jesus' opinion, John the Baptist was the greatest of all the prophets—Elijah returned to prepare men for the great and terrible Day of the Lord. These new healing powers granted Jesus by God may have indicated to him not only that the Kingdom of God was encroaching upon his own age, but that in the great battle between God and Satan he had a positive role to play over and above that of prophet and bringer of glad tidings.

A similar conclusion can be reached by following another line of thought, namely that concerning the growing jeopardy in which his life was held. Jesus had already encountered the problem of jeopardy in connection with John the Baptist's death. "Elijah came and they did with him what they wanted" (Mk. 9:13), he says. This fact presented a real problem, for how could John the Baptist be Elijah if it was true that they did to him what they wanted? The elements of Jesus' answer are contained in his statement about storming the Kingdom in the violent era of John the Baptist. Violence, he may have come to believe, is the incalculable factor of any transitional age. Men of little faith might doubt whether God was protecting those whom he sent; but was it not better to believe that through the unexpected death of his witnesses God was in fact accomplishing his purpose?¹³ The question would have become more acute for Jesus when he realized that he would probably meet a fate similar to John's and that the institutionally oriented hierarchy would con-

¹³ See C. H. Kraeling, *John the Baptist* (New York, 1951), pp. 156–57.

trive ways and means of disposing of him. The problem for Jesus would probably have been not one of personal anxiety but rather one of faith, and it may well have been brought to a head by his going to Jerusalem. The motive for going to Jerusalem was probably the same as that of his Galilean work, the search for the "lost sheep of the house of Israel." But at Jerusalem everything conspired to create a dangerous situation: the attitude of the crowds, the act of the woman who anointed him king, disloyalty in the ranks of his disciples, and the accusations of those who denied that his authority came from God. Out of this jeopardy in which he found himself and out of the struggle to maintain faith in God's ultimate victory may have come the conviction that, if God permitted his death, his death must have some positive and creative meaning in the interplay of titanic forces unleashed with the coming of John the Baptist.

If Jesus did believe that in the economy of God's plan of redemption his life must have a positive meaning, how could he interpret God's intention? The synoptic evangelists report that when Jesus spoke of his death he said that the Son of Man must suffer, thus combining certain ideas from Enoch and from the II Isaiah. The combination of reference to the transcendental being who was to come on the clouds of heaven for the final judgment on the one hand, and to the Suffering Servant of II Isaiah on the other meant that both figures in the combination had been drastically altered. To be sure, the author of the Parables of Enoch refers to the Servant when he speaks of the Son of Man as a light to the Gentiles, but he does not allude to the suffering and humiliation of the Servant. On the other hand, the Servant of II Isaiah was not generally interpreted messianically. It is significant that when the interpretation was made in the Aramaic text of the Targum on Isaiah 52: 13-53:12, the element of the Servant's suffering and death was assigned not to the Messiah but to the nation of Israel or to the Gentile nations.¹⁴ That Jesus could have found the solution to the problem of his place in God's plan by combining the figures of the Suffering Servant and the Son of Man is suggested by an analogous

¹⁴ See William Manson, *Jesus the Messiah* (Philadelphia, 1946), pp. 229-32.

combination of Son of Man and the Elect One in the book of Enoch.¹⁵

The author of the Parable section of Enoch has developed from Daniel's Son of Man a new messianic figure. In Enoch, the Son of Man is called "the elect one of righteousness and of faith" (En. 39:6-7), chosen by the Lord of Spirits (En. 46:3), whose name was chosen, yet hidden, before the created world came into existence (En. 48:3). In him dwells wisdom, insight, understanding (En. 49:3) and, most prominently, righteousness (En. 46:3). Since God has revealed to him the mysteries of his nature and activity, he is able to pass on the secrets of wisdom and counsel (En. 51:3) and the treasures of the hidden (En. 46:3). While he has the appearance of a man, he is like one of the holy angels (En. 46:1) and is so intimately related to the Lord of Spirits that he dwells under the wings of the Lord of Spirits and at the judgment day will sit beside God on his throne (En. 49:2, 51:3) to destroy the mighty kings and all those who have led the world astray including the demonic being, Azazel, together with his associates (En. 45, 46, 55, and esp. 55:4, 63, 69:27).

Particularly interesting in the Parables is the relationship expressed between the Son of Man as the Elect One to the elect ones. According to the Parables, Enoch himself was this Son of Man (En. 70-71) whose name had been chosen before creation. He lived as a man, but at the end of his life was taken to the realm of heaven, where he remained hidden but protected by the Lord of Spirits. The judgment day was his crucial moment of activity; it was even called the day of the Elect One (En. 61:5). On this crucial day he would be revealed to his elect ones and to the congregation of the elect who had been sown, presumably as the eternal planting, and who would stand before him as the "house of the congregation." The revelation of the Elect One seated upon the throne of his judg-

¹⁵ Specifically the Parables, comprising chaps. 37-71 of the pseudepigraphic book of Enoch, which are dated by Charles to the period 94-64 B.C. See R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1913), II, 171. For the interpretation of the figure of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch, see R. H. Charles, *Book of Enoch* (Oxford, 1893), Appendix, and G. F. Moore, *Judaism* (Cambridge, 1927), II, 303-5, 333-35.

ment would be received with great joy by the elect ones, for it would be the occasion of their separation from sinners, because they had hated the world of unrighteousness (En. 48:7), and the occasion of rest from oppression (En. 53:7), of resurrection of the righteous dead (En. 49:3), and of peace in God's presence (En. 45:3-4). The more positive aspect of the Son of Man's part in the soteriological drama is his support of the righteous and his illumination of those who had been in darkness, the Gentiles and the troubled of heart. Moreover, the relationship of the elect with the Son of Man is to remain unbroken throughout eternity after the judgment day. Their fellowship with him will continue day and night, its intimacy symbolized by the eating of a meal with him (En. 62:14). They will forever wear garments of glory and of life which would never grow old (En. 62:15). The assurance of his continual and abiding presence with them is stressed in the closing section of the Parables in which "Enoch" has learned that he is to be the Son of Man.

"Thou art the Son of Man who art born unto righteousness
 And righteousness abides over thee
 And the righteousness of the Head of Days forsakes thee not."
 And he said unto me:
 "He proclaims unto thee peace in the name of the world to
 come,
 For from hence has proceeded peace since the creation of the
 world,
 And so shall it be unto thee forever and forever and ever.
 And all shall walk in thy ways since righteousness never forsaketh thee:
 With thee will be their dwelling places, and with thee their
 heritage,
 And they shall not be separated from thee forever and ever
 and ever."¹⁶

After the revealing angel has identified Enoch as the Son of Man by stressing the eternal nature of the fellowship between the Son of Man and the Lord of Spirits and between the Son of Man and

¹⁶ En. 71:14-16.

the elect ones, the author gives his own conclusion to the Parables as follows:

And so then shall be length of days with that Son of Man
And the righteous shall have peace and an upright way
In the name of the Lord of Spirits forever and ever.¹⁷

If Jesus identified himself with the Son of Man, he probably did so along these lines and in an anticipatory sense, using the designation as an expression of his faith in God and of his own assurance that God would continue to use him beyond death for the inauguration of the new age. In his conflict with religious authorities, Jesus is portrayed as praying his way through to a realization of his place in God's plan and as wrestling with the sense of duty imposed upon him. His struggle and suffering may well have been what led him to rethink the role of the Messiah in positive and constructive terms suggested by the figures of the Suffering Servant and of the Son of Man. Jesus' own conclusions may therefore well be the basis of the Church's continual confession of him as the Messiah.

A comparison of the roles of the Teacher of Righteousness and of Jesus as founders of religious movements reveals a few similarities and some notable differences. Both were persons of the highest religious and vocational endowment and consecration. Both stood within the religious tradition of their own people, the tradition of the Bible. Both related their vocational consciousness and activities to the fulfilment of the promises of redemption set forth in that tradition. Both attracted to themselves followers whom they taught and who believed in them. Both came into conflict with the religious authorities of their respective periods and by virtue of this conflict became the occasion for their followers' separating themselves from the parent community. Both were revered by their followers after their death. The Teacher of Righteousness as a priest gave the community of his followers a priestly cast; Jesus, not being associated in a professional way with the religious life of his people created an association lacking professional or national character and held together by the response to God's offer of the Kingdom and

¹⁷ En. 71:17.

by its relation to himself. The Teacher of Righteousness established a normative procedure for the interpretation of Scripture; Jesus associated with his preaching of the Kingdom of God ethical imperatives that became norms and laws for his followers. The Teacher of Righteousness looked for the consummation of the divine plan for redemption in the foreseeable and calculable future; Jesus, in common with John the Baptist, saw the consummation at hand and indeed already in process and was faced with the necessity of finding a solution of the contradiction between this conviction and the tragic fate that had overtaken John the Baptist and threatened him. The vocational self-appraisal of the Teacher of Righteousness may have extended into the prophetic sphere; Jesus' vocational consciousness may have begun in the prophetic sphere, but he appears to have found a positive significance for his own death by interpreting and applying to himself the idea of the Suffering Servant and on this basis have thought of himself as the one whom God would designate to come on the clouds for judgment. Thus the difference between the points from which the two founders' lines of thought started led ultimately to a difference in the point where they came out.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Search for Redemption within the Hebraic Tradition

One of the chief problems confronting a separatist group is the attempt to define for itself the basis of its break from the religious point of view of the parent body. Generally this definition includes a polemic against the leaders of the larger group who, in the opinion of the separatists, have departed from, neglected, or distorted the essential values of the inherited religious tradition. The Qumran Sect and the early Church were by no means the first in Israel's history to have made such a protest, for as early as the period of Israel's conquest of Palestine the Nazarites refused to conform to the religious trend of the times, and later, in the period of the monarchy, the Rechabites and the great prophets of Israel dissented from the religious authorities of their day.

During the first centuries before and after the common era, the Qumran Sect and the early Church continued this historic protest against those whom they regarded as violators of the Old Testament tradition. At the same time they claimed for their separatist groups the authority of that tradition. Thereby they sought to establish themselves, not as novel and untried religious movements, but as communities with a well-tested understanding of man's existence. In the opinion of New Testament and Qumran authors, neither the Teacher of Righteousness nor Jesus believed that he was breaking with the tradition. Each felt he was trying to bring the fundamental tenets of the ancient faith to clearer focus. The only difference here is Jesus' more radical and independent attitude to-

ward the tradition. While the Teacher was opposed to "perverters of truth" and "interpreters of lies," it is reported that Jesus said: "You have heard it said of old, but I say unto you."

Since both the Qumran Sect and the early Church regarded the biblical tradition as fundamental for their religious beliefs, it is appropriate to inquire here how they interpreted the Old Testament and which passages they found particularly relevant for interpretative purposes. The first question concerns their methods of interpretation and the second their principles of selection.

In the process of his search for redemption in the Hebraic tradition, the Teacher of Righteousness established in the wilderness of Qumran a school of biblical interpretation. Any candidate presenting himself for full membership was required to spend at least two years of preliminary training in the study of the Law with a master of the school. If he successfully passed his entrance examinations, he was allowed to partake fully in all the Sect's activities, especially in the important meetings held to discuss the meaning of Old Testament passages. The Sectaries conducted these meetings with great solemnity. The priests filed in first to take their seats. The elders and all the rest of the people followed, each according to the rank given him at the annual meeting. Strict discipline was maintained. When the most notable men gave their opinions, no enthusiastic young scholar dared to break into their discourses. By having each man speak in turn, the Sectaries prevented confusion and disorder. When one of the younger men, who had not yet attained the rank of master, wished to speak, he first had to stand for recognition. He might or might not be granted permission to address the august body (DSD 6:8-13). Indeed, if any one abused the solemnity of the meeting by falling asleep during the session, or by leaving without permission or without cause, he would be punished according to the seriousness of the crime (DSD 7:10-12). The meetings required alertness and willingness to participate. In fact, it was the duty of everyone present to search diligently for any hidden meaning in the Scriptures, and, even though a sudden inspiration might seem to lead to apostasy, the inspired person should not hesitate to express what might be the key to understanding a difficult passage (DSD 8:11-12). The rewards for exceptional and worthy inter-

pretative abilities were handed out at the annual meetings, for perfection in this field made possible advancement in rank for a year.

A passage selected from the Damascus Document illustrates, not only the Sectaries' familiarity with the literature of the Old Testament, but also one of their methods of interpreting its texts. The passage appears in the introductory section of the document, where the author urges the Sectaries to heed the lessons to be learned from history and the warnings of the prophets. The writers of the historical books, he feels, have proved from the records of the past that even though the stubborn, rebellious, and disobedient majority of the nation should have brought the entire people to a justly deserved destruction, God in his mercy had saved a righteous remnant. Similarly, the author believed, the prophets had warned that in the last generation also a remnant alone would survive the catastrophe of the judgment day. The passage quoted below gives his interpretation of this prophetic prediction and his claim that prophecy concerning the remnant had been fulfilled in the Qumran Sect which, though persecuted during these last years of the world's history by evil men, would be redeemed by God.

This was the time concerning which it was written, "Like a stubborn heifer, Israel was stubborn" [Hos. 4:16], when arose "the men of scorn" [Is. 28:14, Ps. 29:8], who preached to Israel lying words and "led them astray in a trackless wilderness" [Ps. 107:4, Job 12:24] so that he "brought low their iniquitous pride" [Hab. 3:6 with grammatical changes of the biblical text for adaptation to the present context] so that they turned aside from the paths of righteousness, and "removed the landmark which the forefathers had fixed in their inheritance" [Deut. 19:14 with grammatical changes of the biblical text for adaptation to the present context], so making the curses of his covenant cleave to them, "delivering them to the sword" [Ps. 78:62] "that wreaks the vengeance of the covenant" [Lev. 26:25]. For they sought "smooth things" [Is. 30:10] and those "illusions" [Is. 30:10] and looked for breaches, and chose the "fair neck" [Hos. 10:11]; and they "justified the wicked and condemned the righteous" [Ps. 17:15] transgressed the covenant and violated the statute. And "they banded together against the life of the righteous" [Ps. 94:21] and "all who walked up-

rightly their soul abhorred [conflation of Ps. 15:2 and Am. 5:10], and they pursued them with the sword and exulted in "the strife of the people" [Ps. 18:44]. Then was kindled the wrath of God against the congregation, laying waste all their multitude; and their deeds were uncleanness before him.¹

In this passage interpretative study takes the form of an intricate weaving together of Old Testament passages.

The Habakkuk Commentary was the first Qumran document to bring to the attention of the modern scholarly world another, more unusual method of interpreting the Old Testament practiced by the Sectaries. Actually the same method had been followed in the previously published Damascus Document, but in that context its importance was not recognized. It was not until the Habakkuk Commentary and fragments of similar commentaries on other prophetic books and the Psalms were discovered that it was realized how widespread was this type of interpretation and how significant it might be for an understanding of the outlook of the authors of the New Testament. In this type of interpretative study of Old Testament Documents, the Sectaries first divide them into short sections and then offer an interpretation of the section quoted. The interpretations are introduced by various formulas, but, in general, the phrases "this means," and "its interpretation bears on," are used.²

¹ Dam. Doc. 1:13-2:1 (Burrows' translation, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York, 1955], pp. 349-50). Biblical references indicated in this passage are those noted by Chaim Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford, 1954), pp. 4-6.

² For the list of variants, see K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew* (Uppsala, 1954), pp. 185-90. The formulas introducing quotations are varied. Usually, when quoting from the Law, the Sectaries prefaced the selection by such introductory phrases as, "as Moses said," "that it says," "as it is written," or "it was written." When quoting the Prophets, they frequently referred to the prophet by name; for example, "as God established it for them by the prophet Ezekiel, saying," "as God spoke by the prophet Isaiah the son of Amoz, saying," "as Isaiah said," or "as God said" without the prophet's name. In referring to their own works the Sectaries merely stated that the full details on a certain point might be found in a specified document. One finds the formula for which the Sectaries are particularly famous in their commentaries on biblical documents. In this case they generally quoted the Old Testament passage first and then started the commentary by the expres-

Before entering into a discussion of this particular type of interpretation, it will be helpful to quote a few of the most familiar and important examples from the Sectaries' literature. Two quotations taken from the Habakkuk Commentary will serve as illustrations. The first deals with Habakkuk's prophecy regarding the advance of the Chaldean armies, which God had aroused to conquer the earth and which the Quniran commentator interpreted as referring to the armies of the Kittim (or Romans).

For lo, I am rousing the Chaldeans, that bitter and hasty nation [Hab. 1:6]. This means the Kittim, who are swift and men of valor in battle, overthrowing rulers and subduing them in the dominion of the Kittim. They take possession of many lands and do not believe in the statutes of God. Over smooth ground they go, smiting and plundering the cities of the earth, for that is what it says: *to seize habitations not their own. Dread and terrible is he; from himself his justice and his exaltedness proceed* [Hab. 1:7]. This means the Kittim, the dread and terror of whom are on all the nations. And with deliberation all their planning is to work evil, and with cunning and deceit they proceed with all the peoples. *Swifter than leopards are his horses, and more fierce than even wolves. His horsemen advance proudly, they spread out, from afar they fly like a vulture swift to devour* [Hab. 1:8]. *They all come for violence; the aspect of their faces is an east wind.* This means the Kittim, who trample the earth with their horses and with their animals; and from afar they come, from the coasts of the sea, to devour all the peoples like a vulture without being satisfied. And with wrath and indignation, with hot ire and furious anger they deal with all the peoples; for that is what it says: *The aspect of their faces is an east wind. They gather captives like sand* [Hab. 1:9].⁸

The second quotation selected from the Habakkuk Commentary deals with Habakkuk's curse upon the destroyers of cities, which is interpreted to refer to the persecutor of the Sect.

sion, *peshet*, or a similar phrase, which can be translated "this means," or "its interpretation bears on."

⁸ DSH 2:11-3:14 (Burrows' translation, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 365-66).

Woe to him who builds a town in blood and founds a city in iniquity! [Hab. 2:12] *Is it not, behold, from Yahweh of hosts that peoples labor only for fire, and nations weary themselves for naught?* [Hab. 2:13] This saying means the preacher of the lie, who enticed many to build a city of delusion in blood and to establish a congregation in falsehood for the sake of its honor, making many grow weary of the service of delusion and making them pregnant with works of falsehood, that their toil may be in vain, to the end that they may come into judgments of fire, because they reviled and insulted God's elect.⁴

Later in the Commentary the author modified this scheme slightly by quoting an entire section of the book of Habakkuk, dividing the quotation into separate phrases and giving his own equations for each of the terms in the section quoted. Two passages from the Damascus Document will demonstrate this procedure to better advantage. In the first the commentator quotes and interprets a section from "the song of the well" in Numbers 21:17-18 to show how the Sect had found life-giving water in the study of the Law. After having quoted the entire passage, the author gives an explanation of each significant word in the quotation. In the course of his interpretation he strengthens his argument by further proof from Scripture.

But God remembered the covenant of the forefathers, and raised up from Aaron men of understanding, and from Israel wise men. And he made them listen, and they dug the well. *A well which princes dug, which the nobles of the people delved with the staff* [Num. 21:18]. The well is the law, and

⁴ DSH 10:6-13 (Burrows' translation, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 369). The attempt to identify the unnamed persons in the Commentary has elicited many ingenious suggestions. The identification of persons is of little importance for the present discussion as long as the Commentary is dated in the pre-Christian or early Christian period. The range of historical periods into which the Kittim, the Teacher of Righteousness, the preacher of the lie, and other unnamed persons have been set begins with the pre-Maccabean era in the early 2d century B.C. and ends with the appearance of the medieval Karaite literature. For Burrows' argument that the Qumran manuscripts cannot be later than 70 A.D., see his discussion in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 73-119.

those who dug it are the captivity of Israel, who went out from the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus, all of whom God called princes, because they sought him, and their glory was not rejected in the mouth of anyone. And the staff [or legislator] is he who studies the law, as Isaiah said, "He produces an instrument for his work" [Is. 54:16]. And the nobles of the people are those who come to dig the well with staves [or rules] which the staff [or legislator] prescribed to walk in during the whole period of wickedness; and without them they shall not attain to the arising of him who will teach righteousness at the end of days.⁵

The second passage, also from the Damascus Document, interprets a passage taken from Amos 5:26-27 in which the prophet of the eighth century B.C. foretold the captivity of northern Israel. The Qumran interpreter, however, make it refer to the study of the Law and Prophets undertaken by the Sectaries "exiled" in Damascus.

When the two houses of Israel separated, Ephraim departed from Judah; and all who turned back were given over to the sword, but those who stood firm escaped to the land of the north, as it says, *And I will exile the sikkuth of your king and the kiyyun of your images from the tents of Damascus* [Am. 5:26-27]. The books of the law are the booth of the king, as it says "And I will raise up the booth of David that is fallen"; the king is the assembly; and the kiyyun of the images are the books of the prophets, whose words Israel despised; and the star is the interpreter of the law who came to Damascus, as it is written, "A star shall come forth out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel." The sceptre is the prince of the whole congregation. And when he arises, he "shall break down all the sons of Seth."⁶

The Qumran Sect was not the only Jewish group concerned with an interpretation of canonical materials, for the rabbinic scholars of Palestine and of the Alexandrian school represented by Philo had also developed interpretative procedures. Indeed, it has been sug-

⁵ Dam. Doc. 6:2-11 (Burrows' translation, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 353-54).

⁶ Dam. Doc. 7:12-20 (Burrows' translation, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 355).

gested that the Qumran Sect modeled its interpretation of Scripture on the patterns of one or the other of these schools. A few words about their hermeneutic procedures will therefore be in order.

The rabbis of Palestine traced the authority of their oral interpretation of the law from Shammai and Hillel back to Moses himself (Aboth 1:1-12). The body of this interpretative tradition, they believed, had been passed by word of mouth from Moses' generation to the Pharisees and was for them as sacred and indisputable as the written Law in the first five books of Moses upon which their oral tradition was based. While the rabbis did not make a compilation of this interpretative material in written form until A.D. 200, nevertheless passages in the Mishnah may serve as examples of their typical interpretative methods. According to Danby, the following passage is typical of this school.⁷ The interpreter has taken a Deuteronomic law regarding inquest into unsolved cases of murder and tried to make the details of the ancient law apply to court procedures of his day. Since the rabbinic interpreter assumed familiarity with this biblical passage, the Mishnaic passage is not clear to the modern reader without a brief summary of the Deuteronomic law. According to the ancient Law, when a man was murdered and the guilty man not found, the murdered man's heifer was slain so that all the men from the neighboring villages and towns could wash their hands over the slain heifer, declare their innocence, and petition God for forgiveness. The rabbis comment on this law as follows:

1. The rite of the heifer whose neck is to be broken is performed in the Holy Language, as it is written, *If one be found slain in the land (lying in the field) . . . then thy elders and thy judges shall come forth*. Three used to come forth from the great court in Jerusalem. R. Judah says: Five, for it is written, *Thy elders*, (that is, not less than) two; and *thy judges* (that is, not less than) two; the court must not be divisible equally, so they add to them yet one more.

⁷ For a discussion of the material in the Mishnah, see H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (Oxford, 1933), pp. xii-xxxii and, especially, p. xxiv, where he lists passages of the Mishnah coming from this earlier period.

2. If he is found hidden in a heap or hung on a tree or floating on the water, they do not break the heifer's neck, for it is written *in the land*, and not hidden in a heap; and *lying*, and not hung on a tree; and *in the field*, and not floating on the water. If it is found near to a frontier, or to a city wherein the greater part are gentiles, or to a city wherein is no court, they do not break the heifer's neck. They make measurement only from a city wherein is a court. If it is found at a like distance from both towns, they each bring a heifer, two in all. So R. Eliezer. Jerusalem does not bring the heifer whose neck is to be broken.

3. If the head of the slain is found in one place and his body in another, they bring the head to the body. So R. Eliezer. Jerusalem does not bring the heifer whose neck is to be broken.

4. Whence did they measure? R. Eliezer says: From his navel. R. Akiba says: From his nose. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says: From the place in which he was wounded—from the neck.

5. When the elders of Jerusalem had departed and gone away the elders of that city brought *a heifer from the herd which had not been wrought with and which had not drawn in the yoke* (a blemish does not disqualify it), and they brought it down into a *rugged* (etan) *valley* (and *etan* is meant literally, "rough"; but even if it is not "rough" it is valid). And they brake its neck with a hatchet from behind it. And that place is forbidden for sowing and tillage, but it is permitted to comb out flax there and to quarry stones there.

6. The elders of that city washed their hands in water at the place where the heifer's neck was broken, saying, *Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it*. But could it have come up into our minds that the elders of the court were shedders of blood—but (they mean), It is not so that he came into our hands and we sent him away without food, nor did we see him (journeying) and leave him with none to accompany him. And the priests say, *Forgive, O Lord, thy people Israel, whom thou has redeemed, and suffer not innocent blood in the midst of thy people Israel*. They needed not to say, *And the blood shall be forgiven them*. But the Holy Spirit proclaims to them, "Whensoever ye do thus *the blood shall be forgiven them*."⁸

⁸ M. Sotah 9:1-6; cf. Deut. 21:1-9.

The interpretative method used by this rabbinic legalist is to work out an exact definition of terms found in the ancient Law and to set down these terms as understood and put into practice by famous rabbis. His ingenious explanation of the biblical passage transferred the ancient law to his contemporary situation and thereby sought to remove all doubt about the validity of the contemporary practice and all uncertainty about the particular juridical procedures involved.

Granted that this passage, a continuous exposition of a text of Scripture, contains the opinions of rabbis of the post-New Testament period, the earlier rabbinic method of interpretation was undoubtedly similar. In the course of the interpretation, the exegete labored in an atomistic fashion over seemingly insignificant phrases. While it appears that he was attempting to expound with greatest care every small detail of the law under consideration, actually he was trying to justify current instruction of the rabbis on the Law in the synagogal schools. To combat the Sadducean criticism that the rabbinical oral tradition had little value, it was necessary for the rabbis to assert that current laws were not recent and unimportant but were based upon and derived from the Mosaic Law. Such legalistic interpretations were not left to the mercy of any layman but came from a long established tradition of training in the rabbinic schools where valid methods and interpretative principles had been properly tested. Since so important a work could not be left to the competitive skill of untutored minds, Hillel formulated seven hermeneutical rules and Rabbi Ishmael set up a standard of thirteen.

At first glance some of the columns of the Habakkuk Commentary appear to represent the kind of rabbinic interpretation illustrated in the preceding quotation. The Sectaries did upon occasion quote a biblical text as a whole and then break up its parts into fragments to establish a more detailed interpretation.⁹ While it is

⁹ Stendahl is inclined to agree with Brownlee that the interpretative method of the Sectaries is midrashic in character. See K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*, p. 185, and W. H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectarians of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BA*, XIV (1951), 54-76. H. L. Ginsberg also thinks that the Habakkuk scroll should be called a midrash rather than

true that the Habakkuk Commentary and other Qumran commentaries similar to it take at times the form of analytic interpretation, the Qumran authors generally used this form as a means of commenting upon the biblical texts for purposes other than as a means of establishing a legalistic practice. The fundamental difference between the interpretative methods practiced by the Qumran Sect and those of the rabbis is one of purpose rather than of form. While the rabbinic interpreters were unconcerned with devotional, messianic, and eschatological ideas and dealt primarily with juristic matters, the Sectaries believed themselves to be living in the last generation and, consequently, turned to those books of the Old Testament which would lend themselves most readily to their eschatological point of view. Occasionally, to be sure, they used the rabbinic method of scriptural proof to increase the authority of their own community regulations in their collections of rules but this practice was not a common or characteristic type of Qumran commentary.

Dupont-Sommer has suggested that the method of interpretation used by the Sectaries should be compared, not with rabbinic types of interpretation, but rather with that of the allegorists, notably with the Neo-Pythagoreans in their treatment of the Homeric texts

a commentary ("The Hebrew University Scrolls from the Sectarian Cache" *BASOR*, CXII [1948], 20; cf. M. H. Segal, "The Habakkuk 'Commentary' and the Damascus Fragments" *JBL*, LXX [1951], 131). It is true that the Sectaries used midrashic interpretation in their juristic passages; for example, in the Dam. Doc. 11:18 and DSD 5:17, where the *peshet* refers to definitions of terms of the Torah. But this kind of scriptural interpretation is quite different from the kind found in the Habakkuk Commentary where the *peshet* style follows a method of interpretation introduced by the author of the Book of Daniel. In this Old Testament document the *peshet* style of interpretation is used most frequently to bring out the esoteric meaning of visions. See also Bleddyn Roberts, "Some Observations on the Damascus Documents and the Dead Sea Scrolls" *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, XXXIV (1952), 368-69, and S. N. Stern, "Notes on the New Manuscript Find," *JBL*, LXIX (1950), 23. I. Rabinowitz thinks that the appropriate title for the Habakkuk scroll is "the interpretation of the words of Habakkuk" ("The Second and Third Columns of the Habakkuk Interpretation Scroll," *JBL*, LXIX [1950], 31).

and with Philo in his works on the Mosaic Law.¹⁰ Here again it seems appropriate to quote several typical Philonic passages to test the validity of Dupont-Sommer's suggestion. Two examples will show how Philo sometimes interpreted a biblical text literally and allegorically, as in his very important work called *Questions and Answers*, or merely allegorically, as in his most famous treatise, *The Allegory of the Holy Laws*.

In *Questions and Answers* Philo first quotes a phrase of Scripture by introducing it with the question-formula, "What does it mean when it says" and then customarily gives it both a literal and a spiritual meaning. His discussion of Genesis 7:1b, which states that God had called Noah the only righteous one of his generation, serves as an example of this type of phrase-by-phrase exposition of the Pentateuch. He says here,

It is an admirable expression which is meanwhile added, the one which says, *in this generation have I seen thee righteous*, that he might not appear to condemn earlier generations, nor cut off the future hope of generations of later times. This is the literal sense. But according to the spiritual meaning, when God will have the mind, the ruler of the soul, which is the head of the family, then he saves likewise the whole family together with him; I mean all parts . . . and the things of the body. As the mind is in the soul, so the soul is in the body. Through good advice all parts of the soul thrive, and the whole house is benefited along with it. When the whole soul is in good condition, then all of its house likewise is found to be benefited with it, namely the body [profits] through sound conduct and continence, after those passionate desires which cause diseases have been destroyed.¹¹

Here Philo gives the impression that he was trying to persuade the literalists among the Jews at Alexandria to recognize the significance of a more profound and spiritual interpretation hidden within the biblical text.

¹⁰ Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford, 1952), p. 26. Dupont-Sommer has been overly influenced by Philo's comments regarding the Essenes' adoption of the Alexandrian method of interpretation.

¹¹ *Questions and Solutions* II, 11.

In *The Allegory of the Holy Laws*, however, Philo's interpretation of scripture was much more complex, lengthy, and involved. He used this commentary on the laws of the Pentateuch as an opportunity to bring out all that he thought Moses had intended to say regarding the nature of man, politics, ethics, psychology, mysticism, etc. Since Philo usually digressed very far from the biblical text, he found it necessary to refer to it at times in order to resume the argument of his discussion. For this reason a rather lengthy quotation from his very extended treatment of Genesis 2:10-14 must be given. The biblical text itself merely described the division of the river flowing from the Garden of Eden into four branches, Pishon, Gihon, Hiddekel, and the Euphrates.

A river goes forth from Eden to water the garden; thence it is separated into four heads; the name of the one is Pheison; this is that which encircles all the land of Evilate, there where the gold is; and the gold of that land is good; and there is the ruby and emerald. And the third river is Tigris; this is that whose course is in front of Assyria. And the fourth river is Euphrates [Gen. 2:10-14]. By these rivers his purpose is to indicate the particular virtues. These are four in number, prudence, self-mastery, courage, justice. The largest river, of which the four are effluxes, is generic virtue, which we have called "goodness." The four effluxes are the virtues of the same number. Generic virtue takes its start from Eden, the wisdom of God, which is full of joy, and brightness, and exultation, glorying and priding itself only upon God its Father; but the specific virtues, four in number, are derived from generic virtue, which like a river waters the perfect achievements of each of them with an abundant flow of noble doings. Let us look too at the particular words used. "A river," it says, "issues forth from Eden to water the garden." "River" is generic virtue, goodness. This issues forth out of Eden, the wisdom of God, and this is the Reason of God; for after that has generic virtue been made. And generic virtue waters the garden, that is, it waters the particular virtues. "Heads" he takes not in the sense of locality but of sovereignty. For each of the virtues is in very deed a sovereign and a queen. "Is separated" is equivalent to "has boundaries to define it." Prudence, con-

cerned with things to be done, sets boundaries around them; courage round things to be endured; self-mastery round things to be chosen; justice round things to be awarded.¹²

What has been quoted above is a small fragment of Philo's discussion of this passage from Genesis, but it is sufficient to demonstrate how by allegorical interpretation he has transcended the geographical banalities of Eden's physical boundaries and has taken his reader into the spiritual realm. The great river has sprung from the wisdom or reason of God and is the prime virtue, goodness, which divides into the four Platonic and Stoic virtues: prudence, courage, self-mastery, and justice.

In so allegorizing the Pentateuch it would almost seem that Philo had abandoned Judaism in order to adopt Greek religious and philosophical ideas. Since, however, in his opinion, Moses had anticipated the Greek philosophers, Philo really used his allegorical method to prove that the Jews had a sacred tradition which already contained and surpassed the greatest ideals of the Greek world. Convinced that Moses had implied more than a literal understanding of the text, Philo turned to the well-known practice of allegorical interpretation to release the deeper spiritual meaning of the Law. Had he been accused of violating the meaning of the original text or of subordinating his Jewish tradition by assimilating it with the brilliant world of Hellenistic philosophical and religious thought, he would have been the first to deny it, for essentially he felt no contradiction between the Jewish and the Greek understanding of man's place in the universe. In fact, what he did for Judaism by way of interpreting its tradition for the larger Gentile world was not unlike the theological task performed by the Christian missionaries in rendering the gospel message intelligible to non-Jews.

A comparison of Philo's interpretative exposition of the Mosaic Law with that of the Sectaries indicates that Brownlee is correct in criticizing Dupont-Sommer for stressing the similarities between the allegorical method of interpretation and the method of the Qumran Sect. The strictly allegorical interpretation of the Alexan-

¹² *Allegory of the Sacred Laws* I, 19.

drian school played only a minor role in the Sectaries' search for the hidden meaning of scripture. While Philo's religious outlook may be called a Torah-centered and a Moses-centered Judaism, his motivation for the study of the Law sprang so completely from a desire to unite the worlds of Jewish and Hellenistic thought that he departed much further from Hebraic traditions than would have been conceivable among the Sectaries. Although they were not altogether hostile to ideas from outside their own tradition, their orientation was primarily Palestinian and secondarily Iranian. Methodology alone, therefore, provides no adequate basis for a comparative study of Qumran interpretation. Since Philo and the rabbis developed their hermeneutic principles for specific purposes, it may be asked whether the Sectaries' Bible comment can be defined more accurately along these lines than by the study of formal characteristics?

Both Dupont-Sommer, who suggests the Qumran use of the allegorical method, and Brownlee, who proposes a comparison of Qumran interpretation with the midrashic procedure of the rabbis, note that the purpose of the Qumran interpreters was to transpose the truth revealed to the prophets by God on to a new historical and theological plane. Such observations depart from the question of formal characteristics and take up the question of motivation and purpose, where the issue of locating types of interpretative schools clearly belongs. The difference between Philo, the Alexandrian Jew, the rabbinical schools of Palestine, and the Qumran Sect revolve around the question of the hidden truth which Scripture could reveal if properly opened up. Philo had opened up the Scripture to make room for Hellenistic systems of thought, the rabbis to set forth a complete juristic code to serve the practical needs of the Palestinian Jew. But the Qumran commentaries are attempts to show that God's previously revealed truth was being fulfilled in the current generation. As opposed to the juridical interpretation of the Pharisees and the allegorical interpretation of Philo, these commentaries can be said to represent a fulfilment-interpretation of Scripture.¹⁸

¹⁸ See Bleddyn J. Roberts' article, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Old Testament Scriptures," pp. 75-96, and K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar von Toten Meer* (Tübingen, 1953), pp. 132-35, 158-64.

The author of the Habakkuk Commentary clarified this definition of purpose by saying that God had revealed to the Sect's founder, the Teacher of Righteousness, the hidden mysteries of the prophetic oracles. So inspired, the Teacher believed that what prophets, such as Habakkuk, had written about future events would actually come to pass in the last generation. The genius of the Teacher lay in his interpreting these oracles so that they referred to him and to his particular generation. Following his example, the Sectararies began an intensive study of Scripture in the light of this fulfilment-interpretation. As a matter of fact, the method was not without precedent in Judaism, for the author of the Book of Daniel, who had also lived in a time of terror and tension and in a time when persecutions sharpened religious loyalties, turned to the writings of the prophets for encouragement in quite the same way. He found a basis for the renewal of hope in a passage of Jeremiah where that prophet had predicted the end of Jerusalem's desolation after a period of seventy years (Jer. 70:12). Since the prediction had not yet come to pass, the author of the Book of Daniel assumed that the oracle must still be valid and hence applicable to his day. In the passage of the Book of Daniel which interprets the earlier prophecy of Jeremiah (Dan. 9:20-27) there are a number of details significant for understanding the Qumran dependence upon the author of Daniel. This early apocalyptic author has "Daniel" turn in prayer to God, the God who keeps the covenant and steadfastly loves those who love him and keep his commandments. The prayer is one of confession, admitting the nation's sinfulness because it had not kept Moses' commandments, and of petition, imploring God to save his city, Jerusalem, not on the grounds of its worthiness but on the grounds of his mercy. While praying at the time of the evening sacrifice, Gabriel revealed to "Daniel" the meaning of the seventy years. What God intended in the earlier prophecy of Jeremiah was not seventy years but seventy weeks of years, or 490 years in all. So interpreted Jeremiah's prophecy now became relevant for the author who believed that he was living in the last week of years. During this final period God would destroy the persecutors of the devout and would bring the desolation of Jerusalem to an end. This

entire chapter (Dan. 9) presents a point of view adopted by the Sectarics. Here one finds the threat of a catastrophe about to overtake God's people, the confession of national sinfulness for not having obeyed the commandments, the reliance upon God's mercy for salvation as a necessary supplement to one's acts of piety, private worship at the time of the evening sacrifice, and the hope that Jerusalem would be given again to God's elect. But also, and especially, one finds here the procedure of reinterpretation by which those searching the Scriptures for a clearer understanding of God's purposes could apply them to their day.

Following the precedent set by the author of the Book of Daniel, the Sectarics under the direction of their Teacher apparently established a third school of biblical interpretation for which they claimed divine authorization. With at least three schools of biblical interpretation trying to validate their own systems, it is not surprising that extremely bitter conflicts arose within Judaism over this issue. By reason of their interpretation, the Sectarics soon found themselves involved in a bitter quarrel with the Jerusalem priests and with those whom they called the "interpreters of lies." Persecution was theirs from the days of the Teacher on. The Habakkuk Commentary tells us that the Wicked Priest of Jerusalem tried to silence the Teacher of Righteousness on one of the holy days. Behind this episode probably stood a dispute over the interpretation of laws dictating the times for the celebration of religious festivals. The Qumran Psalms of Thanksgiving also reflect tensions and disputes over the issue of interpretation, for the psalmists accused their opponents of following false prophets, of being enticed by error, and of speaking to God's people with an alien tongue (esp. DST 4 and 7). According to Qumran documents, such interpreters of lies and seers of deceit had not only persecuted the poor yet righteous doers of the Law but had also withheld the draught of knowledge from the thirsty and had given them vinegar, instead of life-giving water, and a poisonous root which would bring death to their own followers. These men constituted the congregation of those who sought "smooth things" in their co-operation with the plans of Be-

lial. The bitterness of the Sectaries' invectives and the gravity of their accusations give some indication, therefore, of the violent tensions caused by the varying claims to authoritative methods of biblical interpretations.

The rejection by rabbinic Judaism of the whole development of apocalyptic literature which thrived among the Sectaries adds to the scope of this conflict. Indeed, it seems somewhat strange that at the rabbinic council held at Jamnia (*ca.* A.D. 90), the rabbis did not also exclude Daniel, the prototype of this kind of literature, from the final list of canonical books. One can account for its inclusion only on the assumption of its great popularity among the Jews who had recently witnessed God's triumph over the persecutors of his people. In any case, neither the rabbis among the Pharisees nor the conservative Sadducees were willing to regard the Sectaries' apocalyptic literature as anything but heretical. Religious authorities of Judaism, therefore, placed a ban upon the Sect's interpretation of the Old Testament whether its members expressed it in the form of commentaries on biblical documents, in documents using Scripture as proof-texts, or in the form of apocalypses where the Old Testament was used with greater freedom.

The early Church also concerned itself with the interpretation of the Old Testament thus indicating its desire to demonstrate that the origin of the Christian movement was rooted in the Hebraic tradition. Although the range of material available from early Christian circles is smaller than that from the Qumran Sect, it is by no means negligible. The Church did have its own apocalypses (Mk. 13 and the Book of Revelation), for which Daniel was again the inspiration. In the main, however, the New Testament authors' interpretation of the Old is connected with quotations from Scripture in their gospels and letters; these quotations, therefore, provide the material for comparing the Christian interpretation of Scripture with that of the Qumran Sect. To be noted in this connection is the fact that Christians too used fulfilment-interpretation. In the nativity stories, for example, the author of the First Gospel states that the birth of Jesus Christ was the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy

concerning the birth of one to be called Emmanuel, or "God with us."¹⁴ This he does, writing:

But as he [Joseph] considered this [Mary's pregnancy], behold, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, saying, "Joseph, son of David, do not fear to take Mary your wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit; she will bear a son, and you shall call his name Jesus, for he will save his people from their sins. All this took place to fulfil what the Lord had spoken by the prophet: *Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel* [Is. 7:14] which means, God with us."¹⁵

While this particular evangelist is renowned for his use of the fulfilment-interpretation of Scripture, he was by no means the only Christian author who so understood the Old Testament. According to the author of Acts, the pentecostal experience in the life of the Church was the fulfilment of Joel's prophecy that in the last days God would pour out his spirit upon all flesh (Acts 2:16-17). Paul and the authors of I Peter and of Hebrews likewise found that the course of events was following a pattern already set forth in times past. Indeed, Paul, who showed more concern over the fate of the Jews because of their rejection of Christ and the gospel than all the others, developed an elaborate and complex argument in Romans 9-11 demonstrating that the Jews were fulfilling all that had been written about the "stone of stumbling" laid in Zion which would make the Jews falter. This stumbling, Paul believed, had come to pass, for the Jews of his day had refused to accept the cornerstone of God's building in Zion: namely, Christ.¹⁶ Paul in this passage (Rom. 9-11) and in Galatians 4 came closer to writing brief commentaries on biblical passages than did other New Testament writ-

¹⁴ Following the precedent of the Sectaries, this evangelist uses the version of the Old Testament text most appropriate for his point of view. Thus in Matt. 1:23 he has used the Septuagint form of Is. 7:14.

¹⁵ Matt. 1:20-23.

¹⁶ In Romans 9-11 Paul has brought together a wide range of Old Testament passages to prove this point and has quoted from Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Samuel, Kings, Job, Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, Joel, and Malachi.

ers. A section from Galatians 4 will show how he dealt with God's promise to Abraham regarding a son to be born of Sarah—a promise which Paul maintained was fulfilled in the birth of the Christian community. Here he writes:

Tell me, you who desire to be under law, do you not hear the law? For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one by a slave and one by a free woman [Gen. 16:15, 21:2, 9]. But the son of the slave was born according to the flesh, the son of the free woman through promise. Now this is an allegory: these woman are two covenants. One is from Mount Sinai, bearing children for slavery; she is Hagar. Now Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia; she corresponds to the present Jerusalem, for she is in slavery with her children. But the Jerusalem above is free, and she is our mother. For it is written, "Rejoice, O barren one that dost not bear; break forth and shout, thou who art not in travail; for the desolate hath more children than she who hath a husband" [Is. 54:1]. Now we, brethren, like Isaac, are children of promise. But as at that time he who was born according to the flesh persecuted him who was born according to the Spirit, so it is now. But what does the scripture say? "Cast out the slave and son: for the son of the slave shall not inherit with the son of the free woman" [Gen. 21:10-12]. So brethren, we are not children of the slave but of the free woman.¹⁷

Interestingly, Paul himself has designated this interpretation as an allegory which, in a sense, it is. But essentially his main concern is to prove that the ancient promises of the Law and the Prophets have now been fulfilled in recent events. His association with the worlds of Hebraic and Greek thought has brought a fusion of interpretative procedures. While this blending is typically Pauline, the dominance of the Hebraic outlook over the Hellenistic is also characteristic of Paul's expression and thought.

Fundamentally, New Testament writers interpreted Scripture, not like the rabbis or Philo, but like the Sectaries. Important for both Qumran and Christian authors was the extent to which Scripture could be said to have foretold events that were happening in their own day. Evidence from the New Testament indicates that its writ-

¹⁷ Gal. 4:21-30.

ers represent an advanced stage of this type of interpretation. The fact that they have adduced selected passages of the Old Testament appropriate to their immediate needs in large numbers and with great ease suggests that in the days of the earliest apostolic preaching the Christian community began to produce in its school of biblical interpretation either commentaries of its own or collections of selected passages in documents known as Testimonies.¹⁸ Whatever may have been the preparatory steps within the Christian community for the use of this type of fulfilment-interpretation, the purpose for which the authors of the New Testament used Old Testament quotations corresponds to that of their predecessors, the Qumran Sect. It would seem, therefore, that in the field of biblical interpretation the Sectaries opened up a new method suggested by Daniel and made it available to the Christian Church.¹⁹

Two central themes emerge from the Qumran interpretation of passages from the Old Testament: the relationship of the newly covenanted group to the old which had rejected God's challenge; and the final outcome for both groups. In the Habakkuk Commentary it is possible to observe how the author has developed his ideas on the second theme, that of God's final judgment. The usefulness of the Book of Habakkuk lay in the fact that the prophet, at the close of the seventh century B.C., was facing a situation fraught with danger for the life of the nation, quite as the Sectaries felt they were. The burden of Habakkuk's prophecy was to bring two complaints before God. The first was that God allowed violent and unrighteous men to trample over the righteous. God answered this complaint by revealing to the prophet that he was arousing the Chaldeans, a bitter and hasty nation against these oppressors (Hab. 1:2-11). Habakkuk's second complaint was that God allowed the wicked to swallow up the righteous. This God answered by saying that the wicked would be punished eventually and the righteous Jew would

¹⁸ See K. Stendahl's discussion of recent theories regarding the early Church's use of testimonies in the writing of the documents of the New Testament (*The School of St. Matthew*, pp. 207-17).

¹⁹ See W. H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BA*, XIV (1951), 54-76, and J. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of Christianity* (New York, 1958), pp. 134-40.

live because of his faithfulness (Hab. 1:12-2:4). The closing section consists of five maledictions "against the conquering nation that is rapacious, unscrupulous, sanguinary, intemperate and idolatrous."²⁰ The whole of this material lent itself admirably to the purposes of the Qumran interpreter who, by relating the oracles to events in his own time and by seeing in them signs of the end of time, was able to develop a vivid picture of the imminent climax of world history.

The Qumran drama of this climax of world history had as its setting the threatened invasion of Palestine by the invading army of the Kittim, the Chaldeans of Habakkuk's prophecy.²¹ Habakkuk's description of the ruthless character of the Chaldeans furnished the commentator with ample opportunity to develop his own characterization of the Kittim who were coming in this last generation to bring about the complete destruction of the world. Like insatiable vultures, they were coming from the distant coastlands to devour all the peoples of the earth. On their triumphant march they were plundering cities and villages without restraint, were overthrowing fortresses because of the iniquity of their inhabitants, and were mocking the great rulers of the earth and mercilessly killing innocent people.

Against this background certain individuals played their roles in the final drama of mankind. The very appearance of these individuals was a further sign of the end of the age. God's protagonists were the Teacher of Righteousness and his followers, the elect, who shared with him the shame and suffering of persecution at the hands of Belial's protagonists, the wicked leaders of their own people. Thus the doers of the Law, the poor and the simple ones of Judah, together with their Teacher stood in bitter conflict with the godless, dissolute, and rebellious Wicked Priest who had led others

²⁰ R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York, 1941), p. 597.

²¹ Burrows reviews the various identifications suggested by scholars for the Kittim and concludes that the term probably refers to the Roman armies (*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 123; see also F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* [New York, 1958], p. 92, and Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* [1956], p. 95).

of the nation astray. The total conflict pointed to one thing only as far as the Sectaries were concerned. Now was the time of decision when individuals must take sides, for the end was near. One either showed his loyalty to God and his God-sent Teacher by obeying God's commands or one was an enemy of God and, therefore, an enemy of his elect and eternally covenanted remnant. Upon the wicked, God's judgment would be just and pitiless, for "in the day of judgment God will destroy all the worshipers of idols and the wicked from the earth."²²

Fragments of other commentaries similar in treatment and outlook and other Qumran documents interpreting passages quoted from the Prophets and the Law dealt with the same theme. The fragmentary nature of most of these documents makes it impossible to say much more than that their authors also referred to the Kittim, the influential apostate priests of Jerusalem, the Teacher of Righteousness, and the participation by all of these in the conflict of these last times when Israel would sow her crops but not reap them, plant olive trees but not get the oil from them because her people kept the statutes of Omri and Ahab.²³

The author of the Damascus Document was not so much concerned with the final judgment itself as he was with demonstrating how Scripture was now being fulfilled by Israel's division into two camps. To be sure, this division had begun in the days of Moses when Israel had stubbornly rebelled against God. But, since Israel continued to rebel and did not join those of the new and eternal covenant, judgment must follow and would bring about Israel's annihilation. Using Hosea's comparison of a stubborn Israel to a backsliding heifer (Hos. 4:16), this author found Hosea's prophecy fulfilled in the rebellious "man of scorn" who preached lies to lead the people astray in a trackless wilderness, turned them from righteousness, deprived them of their ancient heritage in a morally chaotic world, and took pleasure in seeing God's people in strife (Dam.

²² DSH 12:13-13:4 (Burrows' translation, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 370).

²³ This last fragment referred to is a commentary on Micah 6:14-16. The other fragments are commentaries on Ps. 68:29-30, Micah 1:5-7, 1:8-9, Zephaniah 1:18-2:2. See *Qumran Caves*, I, pp. 78-82.

Doc. 1:13-21). The prophecy of Isaiah (24:17) which predicted that three evils would conquer Israel, terror, the pit, and the snare, was also being fulfilled (Dam. Doc. 4:13-19). Isaiah's prophecy had come true because the people were now trapped in the sins of fornication, wealth, and the pollution of the sanctuary.

The last of the Old Testament prophets had predicted that God would kindle a fire upon God's altar and would kindle it not in vain (Mal. 1:10; cf. Dam. Doc. 6:12-14). The kindling of the fire upon the altar, as the Sectaries understood it, was an allusion to the whole manner of the Sect's communal life: its observance of the Law during the whole period of the wicked age; its separation from the men of the pit; its refusal to take money wickedly acquired; its non-oppression of the downtrodden; its ability to distinguish between the clean and unclean and between the holy and the common; its proper observance of the Sabbath, of the festivals and of the day of the fast as appointed by the Sect; its love for the brothers in the Sect; its support of the poor and the needy and the proselyte; and its search for peace. Because God remembered his covenant with the fathers and because he saw that the Sectaries were holding fast to the covenant, he justified them and so the prophecy of Ezekiel (44:15), saying that priests, Levites, and the sons of Zadok were to keep charge of the sanctuary was also fulfilled. Likewise the Sect fulfilled the promise that princes would dig a well and the nobles of the people would delve with the staff, for those in the covenant who dug the well (the Law) were the captives of Israel who fled to Damascus and the staves were the students of the staff, the legislator.²⁴ Without the staff the students could not attain to the rising of him who would teach righteousness at the end of days. Amos' prophecy also, that the fallen booth of King David would be raised and the *sikkuth* and the *kiyyun* of their images restored had also come to pass, for the king was the assembly in exile at Damascus which had now restored the book of the Law (the *sikkuth*) and the books of the prophets (the *kiyyun*).²⁵

²⁴ See Dam. Doc. 7:21, which refers possibly to Ezek. 9:4, and Dam. Doc. 6:3-11, which refers to Num. 21:18.

²⁵ Dam. Doc. 14:16-20; cf. Am. 5:26-27.

According to the author of the Damascus Document, the Sect not only fulfilled in the present what the Law and the Prophets predicted, it might also in the coming judgment expect to find itself sharing with God the task of judging the world. This task was one for which the members must prepare themselves, for, according to their understanding of Hosea's prophecy, God would come in wrath to destroy his rebellious people after a period of forty years when there would be no king, no prince, no judge, no rebuker in righteousness. The Sectarics calculated that the forty-year period would begin with the death of their Teacher. At the end of the period they envisaged a judgment such as the rejecters of God's Law had never seen before.²⁶ Then the poor who had heeded God's commandments would judge and scatter the shepherd and his flock. Whether this view of judgment and punishment is consistent with the Qumran interpretation of Numbers 24:17-19 in the War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness is difficult to say, for there is apparently some confusion in the latter document regarding the agent of judgment. Although judgment itself does not come from man, yet the hymn to the Warrior-Messiah seems to indicate that a human rather than a supernatural being will defeat the Sons of Darkness.²⁷

What one finds in these interpretative passages is the groundwork of the fully developed apocalyptic ideas in Enoch, Jubilees, and the Testaments of Levi and of Naphtali. God has a plan which had been revealed in part to the prophets of old and to Moses and was now being brought to execution through the establishment of the Sect. Though the plan was reaching the climactic point of fulfillment, men still had a chance to enter the covenant and to be given eternal blessings. Those who rejected or fought against the covenanted people would feel the full outburst of God's wrath in which

²⁶ The reference is to Hosea 3:4 in Dam. Doc. Ms. B 20:16-18; cf. the prophecies of Isaiah and Zechariah alluded to in the Dam. Doc. and discussed by Burrows in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 254-55.

²⁷ For the passage from the War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness, see Burrows' *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 397-98.

the elect would take some part as agents of retribution. Furthermore, the decision to join the Sect in these last days involved a moral commitment. If drawn into the Sect, a man must realize the necessity on his part of strict moral and religious integrity of the highest order. This, then, is the substance of prophecy-fulfilment among the Sectaries.

The writers of the New Testament documents who made the greatest effort to relate the origins of the Church to the Hebraic tradition by selecting and interpreting passages from the Old Testament were Paul, the author of Hebrews, the evangelists, and the author of I Peter.²⁸ Their study of the Old Testament proved to be no more objective than that of the Sectaries, for they chose as passages having the greatest relevance for their situation those which dealt with three major themes: eschatology, the true Israel, and the coming of the Messiah.²⁹ In Judaism generally the third of these themes had played a relatively unimportant part. The picture was altered for the Church, however, because it so closely associated its eschatological hopes with the figure of Jesus. Its hopes in him, in fact, had become more significant than its eschatological outlook in general or than any other specific detail of the eschatological drama. Unless some of the unpublished material from the Qumran caves gives evidence to the contrary, it would seem that the Sectaries were not as concerned with this third theme as was the Church. The Sectaries, therefore, apparently regarded their messianic hopes as a detail of the eschatological drama which did not demand the attention given to the theme by the Church.

²⁸ The Letter to the Ephesians, which is probably not a Pauline document, contains only one such quotation. Of the evangelists the author of Matthew has used the fulfilment-interpretation most extensively. Next in order of frequency comes the Fourth Gospel. Luke's use of Old Testament quotations with this kind of interpretation appears most frequently in his sermons in Acts.

²⁹ See C. H. Dodd in his book, *According to the Scriptures* (New York, 1953). C. Roth in his article "The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis" maintains that the Sect was interested also in the redeemer (*VT* [1960], 51), but his evidence is meager.

Although relatively few, the quotations from Scripture chosen by the authors of the New Testament as proof-texts bearing on the apocalyptic-eschatological theme are of utmost importance. In formulating an eschatological picture, the Church referred to passages from the oracles and visions of Joel, Zechariah, and Daniel. According to Luke's report of Peter's first sermon in Jerusalem, this apostle found in the prophecy of Joel (2:28-32)⁸⁰ the solution of the strange, ecstatic experiences of the Church at the time of Pentecost. Using this quotation in Peter's sermon as the earliest statement of the Church's eschatological views, one finds that its members believed, as did the Sectaries, that God had declared to the prophets of old what would happen in the last days. He had revealed to them that his Spirit would be poured out upon all flesh, that Israel's sons and daughters would prophesy, her young men see visions and her old men dream dreams, that strange cosmic phenomena would take place before the coming of the Lord God in judgment, and that in such times whoever called upon the name of the Lord would be saved. The pentecostal experiences assured the Church that these final events had been set in motion and verified the belief that God, through Jesus of Nazareth and especially through mighty works performed by him, had inaugurated the new age. God had raised him from the dead to sit at his right hand. As the Church reflected upon the importance of certain individuals in preparing for the advent of God's kingdom, they drew into the eschatological drama John the Baptist, who came, as it was written of him, to restore all things (9:11-13). Now that John the restorer, Jesus the doer of mighty works, and the spirit-filled community of Jesus' followers had appeared, the early Church believed that God was bringing to fulfilment in these individuals the promises formerly announced to the prophets. Quotations from the Old Testament, therefore, furnished the writers of the New Testament with the basic plot for the eschatological drama. They added certain details to the Old Testament elements of this event. The exalted Christ as the Son of Man returning in glory would reappear to gather together the elect from

⁸⁰ For C. H. Dodd's discussion of this passage, see *According to the Scriptures*, pp. 62-64.

the four corners of the earth and Jesus' followers, as the elect saints, would be reunited with him forever in God's Kingdom.³¹

The realization that Scripture had said, "At the acceptable time I [God] have listened to you, and helped you on the day of salvation" (Is. 48:8; cf. II Cor. 6:2) and that the present moment was the acceptable time or the day of salvation raised the second major issue for the Church; namely, what had God revealed in times past concerning the nature and destiny of those whom God would save on that day? This issue also raised the question, as it had for the Sec-tar-ies, of the fate of those who rejected God's plan of salvation. The problem raised by these questions led the Church to a thorough examination of the Old Testament to discover what God had revealed in times past regarding the separation of the true Israel from the bulk of the nation who had rebelled against him and to discover how the Church could conceivably be the community fulfilling the role of the new Israel.

In their attempt to arrive at some understanding of the Church as the elect group, many of the New Testament authors tried to find scriptural support for the departure of the new order from the old. Indeed, the problem was one with which the Christian preachers of the first generation had already dealt. Stephen's speech of defense was a collection of Old Testament allusions and quotations to prove that Abraham's descendants had lost their chance of fulfill-

³¹ While the origin of the idea of the Son of Man's appearance refers to the Danielic vision in chapter 7, there are certain modifications of this picture in the documents of the New Testament which presuppose Enochic and Qumran influences: that is, that the kingdom is not only to be given to the Son of Man but that Jesus returns as this Son of Man to judge and to save men (see particularly the Parables of Enoch) and that the twelve disciples are to sit on thrones of judgment to take an active part in the judgment in addition to receiving the benefits of God's salvation. The concept of the elect saints acting as judges in the final court scene of the world appears probably for the first time in Jewish thought in the Parables of Enoch (En. 37-71) rather than in Daniel. When one compares Dan. 7:22 with Matt. 19:28, for example, one finds that the saints take a passive rather than an active role in the final days. The view expressed here is contrary to that of C. H. Dodd, who maintains that there is a greater similarity between the eschatological picture of Daniel and that of the early Church (C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, p. 68).

ing their mission as the true Israel because they had continuously resisted God's attempts to save his people. Consequently, the people of the Jewish nation were bringing judgment upon themselves by rejecting God's "Righteous One," Jesus.

With equal severity Paul denounced his own people for their stubborn and rebellious spirit and for their reliance on the special privilege of having God's Law. Since they constantly broke it, their actions fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, who had said that, "the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you" (Is. 52:5; cf. Rom. 2:24). This outcome was a matter of "great sorrow and unceasing anguish" for Paul who longed to be accursed and even cut off from Christ if thereby he could bring his fellow Israelites to salvation through Christ. To them had belonged the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the Law, the worship and the promises, the patriarchs, and Christ according to the flesh (Rom. 9:4-5). Nevertheless they continued to be a contrary and disobedient people to whom God had patiently held out his hand (Is. 65:2; cf. Rom. 10:21) and whom God must temporarily reject because in these last days they had stumbled over the last means offered for their salvation, that is, the cornerstone which God was laying in Zion for the new house in Israel. For Paul this Old Testament reference (Is. 28:16) had been fulfilled in the new approach to God found in Christ, who was the end of the Law and who, therefore, by making salvation through works of no account opened up the way of salvation by faith (Rom. 9:32-10:4; cf. I Pet. 2:4-10). As far as the Christian community was concerned, Israel's rejection of Jesus as the Messiah by crucifying him upon the cross was the climactic act of stubborn rebellion against God, and her continued rejection of Jesus as the Christ could only bring upon her ultimate and complete destruction.

Both the Sectaries and the early Church used an oracle from Habakkuk to show how their communities were fulfilling the role of the true Israel. The oracle declared that God was doing a work which the people would not believe were it told to them (Hab. 1:5; cf. Acts 13:38-44, DSH 2:1-10). Both groups interpreted the passage with reference to the tension which existed in their days between the non-believing Jews and their own communities. As the Sectaries

saw it, the tension-creating act performed by God in their day was the spiritual endowment of the priest (probably the Teacher of Righteousness) who interpreted the prophetic oracles and established the Sect as the community of the new covenant. According to the Church's interpretation, the deed performed by God was the sending of his Son, through whom he forgave men's sins and granted men a freedom formerly unattainable through the Law. While the two interpretations are thus analogous insofar as they account for the communities and their founders, there are also differences. First, the Church used the quotation as a word of warning to the Jews in an effort to show them the consequences of their lack of belief. In fact, an element of amazement enters into the warning. How could the Jews who had heard the Prophets read every Sabbath in their synagogues not believe that the Habakkuk prophecy had been fulfilled in the person of Jesus?³² In other words, the Church was attempting to bring their fellow Jews into the community of the true Israel whereas the Sectaries regarded the element of conflict as the factor which had already determined the unchanging, if not unchangeable, boundaries of the two conflicting parties. Consequently they did not undertake a missionary program. Second, the Church, more than the Sect, made the event performed by God refer directly to the person and work of their founder.

The Church found in the Old Testament many references to the character of God's covenanted community which, it believed, was being realized in its own movement. First, the Church was the true heir of Abraham, not according to the flesh but according to the promise (Rom. 9:1-13; cf. Gal. 4:21-31). The element of physical descent from Abraham had no such importance for the Christian community as it had for the Sectaries. The Church regarded as important the fulfilment of God's promise to show mercy to the chosen ones (Rom. 1:15; cf. Ex. 33:19). Although the members of the Church had not been God's people and did not deserve to be his

³² The evangelists found evidence in the prophets that the Jewish attitude of stubborn rebellion against Jesus would express itself during his ministry. Thus the members of the first covenant, the Jewish nation, fulfilled Isaiah's prophecy by letting their hearts grow dull, their ears heavy, and their eyes shut so that they could not understand Jesus' parables.

people, he had fulfilled the promise made to Hosea that those who were not his people had now become his sons (Hos. 2:23, Rom. 9:25; cf. I Pet. 2:10). In their opinion, they had become sons, not because they were doers of the Law and had faith in their founder (cf. DSH 8:1-3) but because they based their hope upon faith alone. Fundamentally, faith meant giving of one's self without reserve and discovering in the revelation of God in Christ that to which one surrenders himself trustingly, hopefully, completely, and with entire abandon. Second, the Church found that, according to the Old Testament, those who would have faith were not the clever and the wise of the world, for Isaiah had prophesied that God would put an end to the arrogance of human wisdom and thwart the cleverness of the clever (Is. 29:11; cf. I Cor. 1:17-31). Paul believed that God had fulfilled that promise in the preaching of the cross by the Church. The gospel of salvation as proclaimed by the Church concerned the manifestation of God's power to save men through the death and resurrection of Christ. This particular idea, that by the paradox of the cross God had sought to save men, was sheer nonsense to the wise; but for the simple, the despised of the world, and the weak who had no great political and intellectual power and no social prestige, salvation found on the cross was a cause for boasting (Jer. 9:24; cf. I Cor. 1:31). It was a mystery which the "nobodies" of the Church understood (Is. 64:4, 65:17; cf. I Cor. 2:9).³³

In the literature of the Old Testament, the early Church found another well-known theme which it used to define its status as a community fulfilling the promises. The Church asserted that it was the new building erected to take the place of the doomed Temple in Jerusalem. The theme was one familiar to the Sectaries, who were also convinced that they were the holy house for Israel, a foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron which was built with unshakable foundations, a tested wall and a precious cornerstone. Here all Israel would find righteousness in the place of falsehood, a place of atonement for her sins, a house of perfection and truth

³³ Is. 64:4 and 65:17 are quoted by Paul in I Cor. 2:9. The Greek word *teleoi* in I Cor. 2:6 can be translated as "mature" (so the RSV) or "perfect," which seems to convey more accurately Paul's idea of a person completely initiated into an esoteric group as into the Greek mystery cults.

to establish a covenant for eternal statutes (DSD 8:5-10). Even though the Sectaries did not quote and comment upon an Old Testament passage for this description of themselves as the new structure erected to replace the old and decaying building, it is clear that the author of the Manual of Discipline had such an interpretation of Isaiah 28:14-18 in mind. This passage from Isaiah regarding the laying of a precious cornerstone in Zion was one of the Old Testament quotations most frequently used by the Church for a double purpose—to show how the Jews had stumbled over the cornerstone by rejecting the way of salvation offered by Jesus and how it became the foundation upon which the Church itself was built (Acts 4:11, Rom. 9:31-10:4, I Pet. 2:3-10).

Rather than trace the complex and involved development of this metaphor in the writings of the New Testament, let it suffice to note that the author of I Peter found the metaphor appropriate for many of the same purposes as did the Sectaries.³⁴ This writer urged the Church to regard itself as a building made up of living stones into which Jesus Christ, the living cornerstone, had been set (I Pet. 2:4-10). The building was to be at the same time a holy priesthood

³⁴ The metaphor of the Church as a building with a precious cornerstone is a rather complex one for the writers of the New Testament because they associated this Old Testament quotation with a word of Jesus. According to the Passion narrative, Jesus said in effect that within a brief period God would destroy the man-made temple of Jerusalem in order that it might be replaced by a God-made temple (Mk. 14:58, Matt. 26:6; cf. Jn. 2:19). Paul interpreted the word to mean that the God-made structure was the Christian community which had become the Temple of God because it was built upon Jesus Christ as its foundation (II Cor. 6:19, I Cor. 3:10-16). In the generation after Paul, Christ had become the chief cornerstone or the living stone, with the apostles and prophets serving as the foundation for the building (see Eph. 2:19-22 and I Pet. 2:4-10). The writer of the Fourth Gospel has given the idea a thoroughly Christological meaning by omitting the idea of the Christian community in order to interpret the new spiritual building as the resurrection-body of Christ. The reworking of this idea by the author of the Fourth Gospel is of interest because it indicates some of the difficulties presented to the Church by this word of Jesus as it was combined with the Old Testament metaphor. In this connection the author of the Fourth Gospel wrote that after Jesus had been raised from the dead his disciples remembered Jesus' word and believed that which he had spoken *and the Scripture* (Jn. 2:19-21).

which would offer acceptable sacrifices to God through Jesus Christ. In contrast to the first house, which refused to perform its destined task, the Christian community as a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, and God's own people were to declare the wonderful deeds of God which brought them out of darkness into light. Since the Christian community had not been God's people but were now his people, God had given them this responsibility. Comparing the ideas of this passage from I Peter with those of the Manual of Discipline, referred to above, one finds that both communities believed themselves to be the new and eternal structure serving in a priestly capacity to atone for the people and witnessing to the power of God, who was able to deliver the world from the struggle between light and darkness. Again the main difference between the Qumran and Christian interpretations of this Old Testament quotation concerns the place given in the new structure to the founder of the religious movement. Without any reference to their founder, the Sectaries could regard their community as the fulfilment of the promised building. But it was impossible for the Christian community to think of the new building without placing Jesus in the most significant part of the structure. Jesus was the stone giving strength and eternity to the entire edifice.

Both the early Church and the Sectaries believed, therefore, that according to Scripture their own communities and not the nation as a whole were the true heirs of the promises first given by God to Abraham. During Israel's long history, she had disqualified herself as God's people, and, now that the crisis of the last days was about to overtake the world, the Church and the Sect believed that their communities alone were prepared to survive the tragedy. God had guided, sustained, and protected them, and would grant them a place in his Kingdom. Such had been God's eternal plan announced to Moses and the prophets—a plan now revealed by God to the Sect and the Church in these last days. Although neither the Church nor the Qumran Sect felt that they deserved the redemption promised to the heirs of the covenant, they responded with complete dedication to God's revelation of his purpose for them in his eternal plan. Essentially the Sectaries maintained that the promise of salvation, according to Scripture, would be theirs if they

obeyed the laws revealed by God to Moses and the prophets and if they had faith in their Teacher and in his instruction. The unfolding of God's plan took the Church in another direction, not to the Law but to Jesus Christ, in whom God had revealed himself and his will to men. For this reason the Church searched the Scriptures to discover how Jesus had fulfilled the role of their redeemer and savior.

What Paul, as the author of the earliest extant Christian documents, has to say about the significance of Jesus Christ in the light of the promises of the Old Testament is important in this connection. First, he claimed in his correspondence with the Christian community at Corinth that the tradition formulated by the Church regarding the significance of Jesus was one which had its roots in the more ancient Hebraic tradition. Second, he indicated that this Christian tradition had found one episode in the life of Christ, his death and resurrection, significant as a fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy (I Cor. 15:3-4). Since Jesus had died for men's sins and was raised on the third day in accordance with the Scriptures, these events were of supreme importance for the Church, because they were shown to be, not accident, but a part of God's redemptive purpose, which he had made known to Israel in their sacred literature.

By saying that he received this gospel as a part of the Christian tradition and that he was handing it on as received, Paul indicates that he thought of himself as only a link in a chain of transmission. He claims, moreover, that the Christian tradition, dependent upon and related to the more ancient Hebraic tradition, provided the matrix within which an understanding of Jesus' significance had its origin and that only as the Church remained in this tradition was there any guarantee of salvation.

The Christian tradition in which Paul stood had two elements, one with its origin in the Jewish-Christian community at Jerusalem and the other with its origin in the Hellenistic-Christian missionary movement. According to the sermons in Acts, the Jerusalem Church understood the resurrection of Jesus as an event fulfilling the promises of God, for the "prophet" David knew that God would not abandon Christ to Hades but would raise him from the dead

(Ps. 16:8-11, 110:1; cf. Acts 2:14-36, 13:33-37). The Jerusalem church, however, was on the defensive when it tried to explain why Jesus should have died on the cross. While this Jerusalem community accused Jesus' crucifiers of not understanding that the prophetic oracles applied to Jesus (Acts 13:27) and was convinced that God must have had some purpose in permitting his death (Acts 2:23, 4:25-26; cf. Luke 18:31-34), it does not seem to have reached the conclusion that, by his death, Jesus had fulfilled the task of the Servant, which was to make atonement for men's sins (Acts 5:31, 10:45, 13:38-39). The author of Acts gives credit for this to Philip, a Hellenist, who interpreted for the Ethiopian eunuch the passage (Is. 53:7-8) concerning the lamb slain without cause, showing him that Jesus fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah as the innocent victim who bore the iniquity of sinful men. Once having seen how significantly the Old Testament could illumine the purpose of God in permitting the death of his Son, the Church continued so to understand this event. The author of the Fourth Gospel in particular gives an account of Jesus' crucifixion in which various details of Jesus' trial and death are related to ancient prophetic oracles. The synoptic evangelists accomplished the same purpose by interlarding their accounts of Jesus' life with statements that everything written of the Son of Man by the prophets of old would be accomplished: that he would be delivered to the Gentiles, mocked and shamefully treated, spit upon, scourged, killed, and raised on the third day.

The gospel which Paul received from the Church would appear to be a combination of these two traditions developing within the Church. By combining them he was able to unite the two types of Christian communities and to give the Christian affirmations about the significance of Jesus' person and work a maximal relation to the inherited Scripture.

The importance of these Pauline developments emerges when one realizes the impact of his thought upon the authors of other New Testament documents. To be sure, there is a great difference between Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Book of Revelation, and the Fourth Gospel, in what they claimed for Jesus. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, for instance, who declared that Jesus

fulfilled the role of the priestly Messiah, may well have been influenced by the Sectaries more than by Paul. But Paul seems to have paved the way and have done more than all the rest to show that Jesus was the fulfilment of the Old Testament promises.

The purpose and the results of the interpretative study of the Old Testament at Qumran and in the early Church are remarkably similar. The common aim of that study was to find in the sacred literature of the inherited tradition that which was relevant for their particular religious outlook. They tried to establish an essential and historical continuity between themselves and those elements of the ancient Hebraic tradition that dealt with God's covenant promises to his people. As a result, they were selective in their use of Old Testament materials. Whatever bore upon their view that history was coming to a final and catastrophic end and upon their understanding of themselves as the newly and eternally covenanted communities, this they seized upon. As both groups, Qumran and Christian, therefore, interpreted prophetic oracles, they also interpreted history, and in their interpretation followed the prophetic understanding of the role that God played in the lives of men. Life could not be understood as a series of accidents, or as something planned primarily by men themselves in control of the forces shaping their lives, or as a cyclic recurrence of typical events. History was the sphere of God's activity. He announced his plans to the prophets, then he carried them out, directing the developments and situations in which men found themselves. On this issue both groups agree, differing only in the particular ways they applied the oracles to their communities.

CHAPTER SIX

Eschatological Beliefs and Their Basis

In the previous chapter we have seen that the Hebraic tradition was the matrix within which the religious beliefs of the Qumran Sect and the early Church were formed. Dedicated as they were to the study of Scripture, both the Law and the Prophets, the Sectaries took seriously the demands of a righteous God, with the threats and promises accompanying them. They agreed with the prophets that Israel had not obeyed God's demands and had deserved its past punishments. Since, in their opinion, the bulk of the nation still persisted in maintaining a stubborn and rebellious attitude, it now deserved the final destruction threatened by the prophets. The first portents of the imminent catastrophe had already appeared in the coming of the Teacher and in his rejection. The only questions now were, how long until judgment and what the end would be like. What the Sectaries had to say on this subject was part of a larger picture. From the beginning of creation, they believed, God had established certain periods of time during which stated events would and did occur in the life of Israel. To be sure, God had not made clear to his servants, the prophets, the precise relationship of these periods of history to each other and to the terminal period. This new insight was granted by God to the Teacher of Righteousness and his followers, to whom God revealed the mysteries of the past, present, and future.

While the Qumran literature is somewhat vague with regard to the exact demarcation of these historical periods, three elements are clear: (a) that all these periods were part of a fixed schedule of events; (b) that the entire span of history with its division into

periods was sharply contrasted with the last and terminal period of history; and (c) that it was possible to calculate on the basis of prophetic oracles the exact time when the last period of history would reach its end. According to the Damascus Document, God knew the years of abiding and the number and the meaning of all periods throughout the ages of eternity. In an extended passage in the Book of Enoch, visionary in form and fantastic in its symbolism, is found an attempt to define the various historical periods from the creation of the world down to the establishment of God's Kingdom in the New Jerusalem (En. 85-90). But generally the Sectaries merely referred to such periods as the period of wickedness, the period of the destruction of the land, the period of the first visitation, the period of Israel's transgressing, the period of the office of the sons of Zadok, the period for festivals, the period of the affliction of the wicked, and the period of recompense of the righteous. The Sectaries did not define the duration of the time allotted for each of the several periods. The reason for this lack of definition is obvious: they were not chronographers; their only real concern was the last period and their own place in this evolving pattern of history.

The Scriptures did provide the Sectaries with signs whereby they could discern the shaping of events in the present and in the imminent future. The most important of these signs were the appearance of the Kittim,¹ who were overthrowing rulers and destroying the conquered lands; to this they added the appearance of the man of lies, who would lead people astray in the last days, the activity of the priests in Jerusalem, who, as the last priests of history, were robbing people of their wealth, and the advent of the Teacher of Righteousness, who instructed his followers in the events of these last days. God had also proclaimed that in this last period he would raise up a community of priests, Levites, and sons of Zadok. This community had now appeared and their Teacher had explained to its members their place in God's plan. According to the Damascus

¹ For the significance of the Kittim in this respect, see K. Schubert, *Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer* (Basel, 1958), trans. J. W. Doberstein, *The Dead Sea Community: Its Origin and Teachings* (New York, 1959), pp. 93-98.

Document, the final period between the "gathering in" of the Teacher and God's final annihilation of the men of wickedness would be forty years, the same length of time the Mosaic community had lived in the wilderness before entering the promised land of Palestine. The Sectaries' land of promise was God's Kingdom with its center in a new Jerusalem where the Sect's priests would take their rightful places in a purified temple to perform the ancient ceremonies. Although the time for the end delays, so Habakkuk had written, wait for it, for it will surely come. The Sectaries believed, therefore, that, even though the ancient prophets had been ignorant of the length of time and, in some instances, had foreshortened the perspective of history, their prophetic proclamation regarding the coming judgment truly revealed God's intention.

The prophetic oracles had also led the Sectaries to believe that the present age must be dark and foreboding, a time of persecution for God's righteous ones. In this period of wickedness, the righteous must expect violent hostility. According to Isaiah's prophecy, it would be the period when Belial would be let loose to ensnare men with his three evil nets: fornication, wealth, and the pollution of the sanctuary. Even though the wicked were enjoying their ill-gotten booty now and were crushing the righteous, the persecuted were to find hope in that very fact, for they knew that God's deliverance of his people must come soon, that he had never intended the wicked to survive the judgment day, and that he with his elect ones would judge the wicked. They found hope also in the belief that they fulfilled the mission of Isaiah's Servant, who by the will of God, was bruised for the sins of many but whom the Lord would exalt and prosper. During the period of Belial's dominion, the Sectaries were, therefore, to keep the first ordinances of God until the time when God would reveal his salvation. Each member of the Sect was to strengthen the faith of his brother so that his steps might hold fast to the way of God. In this time of crucial testing should a member reject the community's regulations by walking in the stubbornness of his own heart and by following the way of the prince of darkness, his name would be removed forever from the book of life and God's wrath would utterly consume him. But the

Sectary who withstood the terrors and trial of Belial during his dominion might confidently expect a place among the sons of the eternal assembly. These present days of groaning and torture were the days of decision and of the birth pangs of the messianic age.

According to the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness and also to a reference in the Psalms of Thanksgiving, the advent of the messianic age was to be preceded by a long and tiring religious war of thirty-five years.² The war of God would be a "time of salvation for the people of God, and a period of dominion for all the men of his lot, but the eternal destruction for all the lot of Belial." During the first six years, the sons of light were to prepare themselves for the holy war. The purpose of the yearly programs of campaigns and conquests during the remaining twenty-nine years was the defeat of all the enemies of the Sectaries and the God of Israel, including the wicked among the people of Israel. In this war troops were to be arranged in battle ranks and equipped with war darts on which were inscribed such words as "the lightning of a lance for the power of God," or "flashing of a sword consuming the iniquitous slain in the judgment of God." The priests as the leaders of battle were to have trumpets to blow the calls for assembly, for attack, for retreat, for ambush, and for the final assault for victory. On their trumpets were to be inscribed such mottoes as, "the mighty hand of God in battle to cast down all the faithless slain," or "the rejoicing of God at the return of peace." Each battalion was to be led into battle and out of it by men bearing standards which bore such words as "the anger of God with fury against Belial and all the men of his lot without remnant." Though these apocalyptic battles might be terrifying, God would fight for them against the enemy as he had in times past when David fought Goliath and trusted not in the sword or the spear but in God's great name. The weapons of God's righteous men would bring victory to

² For a discussion of the war, see K. Schubert, *The Dea Sea Community*, pp. 88-93. See also M. Avi-Yonah, "The 'War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness' and Maccabean Warfare," *IEJ*, II (1952), 1-5; Millar Burrows, *More Light*, pp. 195-203; and J. van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre* (Leiden, 1959).

the elect, put an end to the age of corruption, and inaugurate the new age of peace and well-being. The document closes on this optimistic note:

Today is his appointed time to lay low and to make fall the prince of the dominion of wickedness; and he will send eternal help to the lot he has redeemed by the power of the angel he has made glorious for rule, Michael, in eternal light, to give light in joy to all Israel, peace and blessing to the lot of God, to exalt among the gods the rule of Michael and the dominion of Israel over all flesh. Righteousness shall rejoice in the high places, and all the sons of his truth shall be joyful in eternal knowledge. And you, sons of his covenant, be strong in the crucible of God until he waves his hand and fills his crucibles with his mysteries that you may stand.³

All this represents a picture and a program carefully defined in all their details.

Although very few of John the Baptist's eschatological teachings have been preserved, his proclamation of the coming judgment day reflects to some extent the eschatological fears and hopes of the Sectaries. He also believed that the judgment day was at hand, though he believed it even more imminent than did the Sectaries. The ax was already at the root of God's own planting, the orchard tree, which would be thrown into the consuming holocaust of God's judgment.⁴ He also tried to awaken an ethical response from men by stressing the terrors of the judgment day and to urge men that their righteousness should exceed that of the demands of the Law. To this end he encouraged men to pray, fast, and be baptized. Both the Sectaries and John pointed to the patriarchs as norms of super-observantistic piety and felt the anger and hurt of rejection by the religious leaders of their people, whom they threatened with the terrors of the judgment day. These similarities do not necessarily imply that John had at any time become a member of the Qumran

³ DSW 17:5-9 (Burrows' translation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York, 1955], p. 399).

⁴ C. H. Kraeling in his book on *John the Baptist* discusses this aspect of John's proclamation, pp. 33-64.

community, for John worked independently, as had the great prophets of ancient times, and was concerned to bring his message to the entire nation. But they do suggest the influence of the Sectaries' eschatological thinking upon one of the most forceful preachers of judgment day and of its consequences for men's lives.

In contrast to the uniformity of the Sect's and of John the Baptist's eschatological outlook, that of the Church in the New Testament period is multiform and represents a variety of conflicting points of view. What gave the Sectaries' eschatology its unity was the fact that they had a single static set of circumstances as the immediate occasion for the development of their thought. The early Christian community, on the other hand, did not remain in Palestine and was subject to pressures from different angles, Jewish and pagan. As the Christian community adapted its thought to the changing environment and to changing times, it was compelled continuously to re-examine and revise its eschatological views.

An illustration of the eschatological outlook of the Palestinian church is the apocalyptic poem contained in Mark 13.⁵ The poem is so traditional in character that it could have been written in any one of several religious communities in Palestine. In the three major sections of his apocalyptic poem, the poet has provided a general scheme for calculating events that will lead up to the end of the world's history. First will come the woes (Mk. 13:7-8) and tribulations (Mk. 13:14-20). Calamities are the traditional birth pangs of the messianic age. But they need not cause alarm, for the end has not yet come. In the course of these woes, nation will strive against nation, and kingdom against kingdom. Nature contributes its confusion to the man-made chaos by non-productivity of the soil and by earthquakes. The further course of the woes will bring the center of the conflict to the region of Palestine itself. There God's holy Temple will be desecrated and the detestable abomination of which

⁵ The material of the chapter has a long and involved history. Only a very few elements of it, chiefly the word about the destruction of the Temple (Mk. 13:32), can be associated directly with Jesus. The bulk of the material represents an apocalyptic poem of the apostolic age, but there are also editorial additions of the evangelist. One such is Mk. 13:9-10.

Daniel had spoken during the reign of Antiochus IV will be set up. When this final woe occurs, the only thing anyone can do is to flee rapidly to the mountains. In fact, unless God had shortened the days, not even the elect would survive. After the tribulation will come the disintegration of the entire cosmic order (Mk. 13:24-25). When that event has taken place, then will come the final act and men will see the Son of Man coming on the clouds with great power and glory. (Mk. 13:26-27). His coming will usher in the day of salvation when the Son of Man will send forth his holy angels to gather his elect from the ends of the earth and the ends of the heaven.

Interestingly, a contemporary event may have awakened within the poet a sense of unity of God's plan throughout history and for the future. This is an episode, mentioned by Josephus, which closely parallels the one of 167 B.C. when, according to Daniel 11:31 as interpreted with the help of Porphyry, Antiochus IV desecrated the Jerusalem Temple by setting up there an altar and a cult statue of himself. Late in A.D. 39 the Roman Emperor Gaius issued a decree that a statue honoring him as Olympian Zeus be set up in the Temple (*Antiquities* XVIII, 8, 2). The decree was supposed to avenge an insult to the imperial dignity made earlier in that same year. Jews had torn down his altar on one of his estates in Jamnia of Palestine, and Gaius, wishing to satisfy his egomaniac desires, decided to force the Jews to venerate him in the Temple of Jerusalem itself. Josephus reports that it was a time of great tension in Palestine and that farmers refused to plant their crops as a protest against the decree.

It is not surprising that the poet of this brief apocalyptic poem in Mark 13 saw the analogy between the action of Gaius and that of Antiochus IV and referred to the previous episode by mentioning the abomination of desolation alluded to in Daniel 9:27 and 12:11. The poet has, in fact, interpreted the episode associated with the abomination of desolation to show how an ancient prophecy was about to be fulfilled in his own time. Daniel had said that the time between the appearance of the abomination of desolation and the coming of God's Kingdom would be three-and-a-half years. Since the prophecy had not come true and since the prophet "Daniel"

could not be mistaken, Daniel's abomination of desolation must refer to the episode of Gaius' decree. In this Jewish-Christian poem there is portrayed a vivid scene of the trials which will come immediately before the end of the world's consummation, an attempt to calculate the arrival of the end, and the deliverance of the elect by a heavenly being of great power and glory. These concepts certainly have their counterpart in the eschatological visions of the Sectaries. In this particular poem, however, the Qumran emphasis on the fate of the wicked is missing, for the poet is concerned only with the gathering of the scattered elect who are to be with the Son of Man in glory. For our present discussion it is important to note that this eschatological poem, like the eschatological works of the Sectaries, maintains that signs of the coming age are and will be apparent and that by recognizing them as signs one may know when the calamitous day will come. For the Qumran Sect and the early Church such calculations had of necessity to be remade when subsequent events did not correspond with prediction.

This traditional eschatological outlook appears also in the sermons of the apostles recorded in Acts. Central to their hope of salvation was Jesus himself, who after his death had appeared to them as their risen Lord. Now they waited for his return as the glorious and triumphant Son of Man to vindicate the elect. Exalted at the right hand of God, Jesus as Prince and Savior had received the holy Spirit which had been promised to those living in the Kingdom and had given the Spirit to those who obediently and trustfully looked to him as the one means of salvation (Acts 4:12). Now his chosen ones, endowed with the new spirit of power, awaited the ultimate fulfilment of the restoration of all things (Acts 3:21). Then as God's elect they would sit upon the twelve thrones with Christ, who was already enthroned at God's right hand.

This traditional eschatological view was one which Paul himself accepted in the earlier years of his missionary activity but apparently had to modify because it lacked relevance for his Greek converts and because it failed to express adequately for him a more profound understanding of Christ's significance. His Thessalonian correspondence indicates, through his answers to questions raised by his first converts in that church, the traditional character of

Paul's early eschatological preaching. It was strongly reminiscent of the kind of eschatological views proclaimed by preachers working in the Palestinian environment which stressed the immediate return of Christ the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven. The imminence of this return had its authority in a word of Jesus to the effect that the Son of Man would arrive in glory before the present generation passed from the world's scene of activity (Mk. 9:1). When Paul in turn so instructed his converts at Thessalonica, he found that it presented difficulties for them. Their queries concerned the lot of those who had already died in their midst without having seen the return of their Lord (I Thess. 4:13-18). Did that imply that they would be at a disadvantage as compared with Christians who were still alive and might expect to see the arrival of the Kingdom? Paul assured them that they would not be, for the few who died in Christ would rise first. Then the great bulk of the living would be caught up with them. The picture which Paul unfolded was one of the heavens opening, the angel Gabriel blowing his horn, tombs opening, bodies becoming revived, and the living united with the dead between heaven and earth.

Paul's letters to the Christian communities in Galatia and at Rome indicate that later he found it necessary to modify this earlier eschatological view. Possibly he recognized that preparation for the Lord's immediate coming led to laziness and poverty, becoming an excuse for loafing. Possibly he realized that he himself might die before he saw the Lord return. Perhaps—and this seems the most likely explanation—he came to feel that the expectation of Christ's return on the clouds was less meaningful than the experience of present union with Christ. He was convinced that he had already become one with Christ by participating in his death and resurrection and hence thought of salvation as a present reality. On the basis of his own religious experience, he claimed that he had been crucified with Christ and that it was no longer Paul who lived but Christ who lived in him and thus transformed his nature. The reality of the experience was so great that he reinterpreted the rite of baptism in these terms. It signified a burial with Christ which killed sin within the participant and a resurrection with Christ from the dead so that the participant might walk from now on in newness

of life. The experience of "being in Christ" did not lead Paul, however, to the cancellation of hope for a future union with Christ. The Corinthian congregation is urged to repeat the celebration of the Lord's Supper "until he [Christ] comes" (I Cor. 11:26). His later letters, however, do seem to reflect a shift in emphasis from a future union with Christ to the present union with Christ and the abandonment of fantastic apocalyptic imagery for an expression of hope for future union with his Lord. At least in his imprisonment letters he speaks of this hope in terms of departing to be with Christ.

In one of the most skilfully constructed passages of his letters, Paul brings together these two concepts, that of present deliverance and that of future redemption (Rom. 8:31-39). Here he expresses assurance of a recognizable triumph in the future because hope sprang from a definite event which already pointed in the direction of complete redemption.

What then shall we say to this? If God is for us, who is against us? He who did not spare his own Son but gave him up for us all, will he not also give us all things with him? Who shall bring any charge against God's elect? It is God who justifies; who is to condemn? Is it Christ Jesus, who died, yes, who was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who indeed intercedes for us? Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, "For thy sake we are being killed all the day long; we are regarded as sheep to be slaughtered." No, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him who loved us. For I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.

In this passage one recognizes the traditional eschatological outlook of the Qumran Sect and of the early Church, for Paul declared that the predicted suffering of the elect during the climactic stage of conflict between great spiritual forces would end in triumph and

not in disaster. As mentioned earlier, however, he has envisaged the conquest of a multiplicity of evil cosmic and supernatural forces rather than a single power of evil, Belial or Satan. Paul also agreed with the Christian community of Jerusalem that the Church had in Jesus Christ a single source of hope for victory over the powers of evil (cf. Acts 4:12). But he strengthened its belief in the returning Son of Man's ability to dethrone these powers by undergirding its hope with the declaration that through Christ, who loved the Church, it had already begun to experience victory over hostile forces.

The generation of Christians which immediately followed Paul (A.D. 67-96) experienced a renewal of persecution which developed locally and sporadically in Rome and in Asia Minor. While these new developments reminded them of a similar set of circumstances associated with their origins as a religious community in Jerusalem, their persecutors now were no longer Jews but Gentiles. Finding themselves again endangered in the larger Gentile world, Christian believers sought with renewed intensity the consolation that would be theirs after the day of final judgment. To draw upon the resource of the eschatological enthusiasm of the first generation was one avenue whereby they might find encouragement to endure the trials and persecution of their own era.

Two Christian writers of this period, the authors of the Gospel of Matthew and of the Book of Revelation, made such an attempt to lay hold of these earlier messianic hopes as a means of encouraging the waning faith of the Church. To heighten this apocalyptic element, the First Evangelist reworked the gospel story of things said and done by Jesus by adding eschatological materials. As the Father had covenanted to him the Kingdom, so the Son of Man would covenant to his persecuted, and yet faithful, followers the Kingdom where they would sit upon the thrones of glory and of judgment with him. (Matt. 19:28; cf. 25:31-46). Similarly the author of the Book of Revelation held out the promises of a glorious redemption before the faithful and chosen ones, who were now sharing in Christ's suffering. Christ the slain Lamb would return soon as the fierce and conquering warrior to deliver them. With the slain Lamb's victory over Satan, the kingdom of the world would become

the kingdom of the Church's Lord who would reign forever and ever (Rev. 17:13-14). Then—

He who sits upon the throne will shelter them with his presence.
They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more;
the sun shall not strike them, nor any scorching heat.
For the Lamb in the midst of the throne will be their shepherd,
and he will guide them to springs of living water;
and God will wipe away every tear from their eyes.⁶

In the third generation (A.D. 97-125) changes in world affairs and the Church's effort to adapt itself to them served to abet the further development of the Church's eschatological outlook. The coming of Nerva as emperor of the Roman world meant a return to liberalism in imperial policy and the disappearance of the harsh repressive measures inspired by Domitian's absolutistic policies. This development provided the necessary protection for the Christian communities so that, generally undisturbed, they were able to set their house in order. Martyrdoms, such as that suffered by Ignatius, were rare. Christianity had come through the severe testing of the earlier days with its local nuclei intact in Syria, Egypt, Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy. By now these nuclei had developed set patterns of worship, the elements of local organization, a heritage of tradition and, above all, a body of religious literature. Christianity was now in a position to produce a new generation of indigenous leaders, men who were firmly established in the Church's life and who could begin to mold and develop the Church both internally and in its relation to the wider environment. Among those known to us by name are outstanding individual personalities such as Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, Hermas, and the Elder John. These men were concerned with two major issues: namely, the organizational problems of the Church and the interpretation of the Christian tradition for an abiding world. It was inevitable that in this period the apocalyptic hopes for the imminent return of the Son of Man on the clouds should be revised. One such revision is to be found in the Fourth Gospel.

⁶ Rev. 7:15b-17.

Of the New Testament writers the author of the Gospel according to John, who probably produced his work during the earlier years of this third generation, stands alone. His interpretative insights into the significance of the Christian hope for salvation were profound, for he understood the true genius of the Christian gospel and of the person of Christ in God's plan of redemption as few formulators of Christian faith ever have. For the Gentile world, where Christianity had now become thoroughly established, the author of the Fourth Gospel found that the eschatological hopes of the Jewish-Christian apocalyptists had no greater significance than did their affirmation of Jesus as the promised Son of David who would come to restore all things for Israel, or of the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven to give the Kingdom to his elect on the day of judgment.

While the Fourth Evangelist has retained some of the traditional eschatology of the early Church and does say that Christ will raise up his own followers on the last day (Jn. 6:54; cf. 5:27-29),⁷ the basic eschatological outlook set forth in his gospel has been transmuted into a continuous mystical or spiritual union of Christ with his own. The entire Christian community shared the sufferings of Christ because they also were not of this world and were, therefore, hated by the world. It also shared with him the present release from the evil ruler of this world who had no power over Christ and his own, because Christ had already overcome the world and its prince of darkness (Jn. 16:33). Since light, eternal life, love, and truth have already been given to God's Son who is one with the Father, the Church—believing in the Son—also possessed these gifts now and was one with the Father. These possessions were theirs because the Church was already one with the Son. Since the Father and the Son were one in unity of thought, purpose, and work, and since the Son's own were also God's own, the Church received God's promised salvation through the Son. He could give eternal life to all who

⁷ Generally these traditionally worded eschatological passages are regarded as editorial additions. That solution may be correct. However, this evangelist is somehow able to hold so many contradictory views in apparently unresolved solution, that other suggestions are possible.

came to him, and, as long as the branches of the Church continued to abide in Christ (the vine) and were thus fruit-bearing branches, the Father would not gather them with the withered branches and throw them into the fire. It was through Christ, the door of the sheepfold, that the flock found protection. He was also the shepherd of his flock who knew his own sheep and was known by them; and the sheep who had not yet come into the fold would also enter and become a part of the one flock (Jn. 10:11-18). Though thieves might enter to rob, kill, and destroy the flock, the Good Shepherd had laid down his life to save the flock. While the author of the Fourth Gospel has gone beyond Paul in reducing the apocalyptic conception of the final day of judgment to an almost negligible element, both have found the assurance of hope for redemption in the appearance of Jesus as the Son of God. But where Paul rooted the assurance of present salvation in historical acts, in Jesus' death and resurrection, the author of the Fourth Gospel determined it by the nature of the person who as the incarnate Word of God revealed and communicated the life of divine reality to the world.

The sharpest formulation of the evangelist's change of eschatological concepts is found in a discussion of God's purpose in sending his Son into the world (Jn. 3:17-21). The Son's function is here said to be to save the world and not to judge it. This view in effect cancels out the whole eschatological drama. Furthermore, the one who accepts Christ in faith is already saved. He has no need to worry about whether he belongs to the sheep or goats in the parable of the last judgment in Matthew's gospel (Matt. 25:31-34). He is not judged and no judgment will ever apply to him. What the evangelist states with regard to the non-believer is equally revolutionary. He who does not believe is already judged. For him the eschatological event of judgment as traditionally believed is also past. The contrast between the Fourth Evangelist and the seer of Patmos, with his doctrine of imminent judgment, is tremendous. For the Fourth Evangelist the great picture of cosmic disintegration as the result of the appearance of the warrior Messiah and Judge is quite incorrect. Judgment for this evangelist does not exist save as a part of the acceptance or rejection of Jesus Christ by the individual. This radically new view has lost associations with Judaism and with

Jesus' eschatological teaching unless the few references to the traditional eschatology is some kind of acknowledgment of the traditional view. If these references are not editorial one wonders why the author has included them. Is it to indicate that he does not wish to be thought of as abandoning the tradition altogether? We do not know the answer.

The fact that the Church succeeded in thus transforming its eschatological beliefs without serious damage to its faith in Christ may signify more than an unusual ability to adapt itself to changes of circumstance and environment. The transformation may have been made easier for it because of Jesus' own reticence on the subject of the ultimate fulfilment. While Jesus shared with the Sec-taries the dualistic concept of a final conflict between divine and satanic forces and the belief that the conflict was reaching a climax, he also confessed his inability to determine the hour of God's ultimate triumph (Mk. 13:32). This mystery was known only to God, who would bring in his Kingdom with full power so unexpectedly that men preoccupied with the normal routine of eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage would be caught unawares. Although God had not revealed to him the hour of the Kingdom's coming, he was showing by his present activity that the Kingdom was already breaking in to some extent upon the present era. Confirmation of this conviction sprang from experience, for Jesus interpreted his ability to perform exorcisms and healings and to proclaim with authority the good news of the Kingdom as concrete evidence of God's decision now to end Satan's hold upon the world. Relevant in this connection are the first three petitions of the Lord's prayer, "Hallowed be thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." If Jesus here requests God to make his name holy by causing his will to apply here as completely as in heaven, this means that God's complete triumph is still something to be prayed for, indeed it is the most important thing for which men can pray.

Jesus' reticence about the arrival of God's Kingdom does not mean that he refused to recognize periods of preparation. He regarded John the Baptist as the one who fulfilled the role of the re-

turning Elijah, and this role was to prepare Israel for the terrifying Day of the Lord. In fact, John's death marked for Jesus the end of an era; John, he felt, belonged to the line of the Law and the Prophets, but that line was ended and those who were least in the Kingdom of Heaven were greater than John (Matt. 11:7-15). But gradually the line of demarcation between the two eras was shifted. Christians began to think of John not as the herald of a final judgment but as the forerunner and herald of Jesus the Messiah. In their eyes, therefore, he belonged not to the end of the old order but to the beginning of the new. So the word of Jesus about the two eras was changed to read, "The Law and the Prophets were until John; since then the good news of the Kingdom of God is proclaimed and everyone enters it violently" (Luke 16:16). The last clause of the saying is obscure, but it appears to substitute for the violence of the period of tribulation the turmoil associated with the efforts of multitudes from all parts of the world to gain admission to the Kingdom. So interpreted, the word visualizes a great missionary success for the Church, the visible embodiment of the Kingdom.

What underlies the change in the eschatological picture here, as in the Fourth Gospel, is the relationship of the Christian to his Lord, a relation so satisfying in itself as to give the believer full assurance of the vindication of his faith without recourse to an expectation of immediate divine judgment upon its opponents. The final judgment could thus be relegated to a more distant future. The relationship between the Christian believer and his Lord is, of course, only the continuation of that between Jesus and his disciples. Thus Jesus' own reticence on matters of eschatology and his personal impact upon his followers are the ultimate element in the transformation in the Church's eschatology.

Having thus set over against each other the eschatological beliefs of the Qumran Sectaries and of the early Church, it remains for us to consider here the basic premises upon which the whole conception of an end to human and world history rests. The ultimate assumption in this connection is that God is the unchallengeable sovereign in cosmic and human events. Selected passages from the first Psalm of Thanksgiving serve as excellent examples of how the Sectaries viewed God's unlimited, authoritative might and wisdom.

[Thou art the source of all might]
and the wellspring of all power;
[yet art Thou also rich in wisdom]
[and] great in counsel

When Thou didst stretch out the heavens for Thy glory,
and [command] all [their host] to do Thy will,
Thou didst also make potent spirits
to keep them in bounds.

Or ever spirits immortal
took on the form of ho[ly] angels,
Thou didst assign them to bear rule
over divers domains:
over the sun and moon,
to govern their hidden powers;

[So too hast Thou done]
touching the spirit of man
which Thou hast created in the world
for all the days of time
and for ages infinite,
to be[ar rule over all his works.]

Thou hast assigned the tasks of men's spirits
duly, moment by moment,
throughout their generations;
and Thou hast determined the mode
in which they shall wield their sway,
season by season;
yea, [Thou hast prescribed] their [works],
age after age—
alike when they shall be visited with peace
and when they shall suffer affliction.

Thou hast [. . . man's spirit]
and duly assigned its role
for all his offspring
throughout the generations of time;
and [Thou hast . . .] it
for all years of eternity.
And in Thy knowing wisdom

Thou hast ordained its fate,
or ever it came into being.

By [Thy will all things exi]st,
and without Thee is nothing wrought.

Shapen of clay and kneaded with water,
a bedrock of shame and a source of pollution,
a cauldron of iniquity and a fabric of sin,
a spirit errant and wayward,
distraught by every just judgment—
what can I say that hath not been foreknown,
or what disclose that hath not been foretold?
All things are inscribed before Thee
in a recording script,
for every moment of time,
for the infinite cycles of years,
in their several appointed times.
No single thing is hidden,
naught missing from Thy presence.⁸

Here the psalmist praises the glory of God, asserting the absolute character of his wisdom and might and declaring that God has allotted to men from eternity their fixed place in his plan. The orderly harmony of the stars and planets in their courses and the succession of the seasons are similar manifestations of God's knowledge and power. The regularity of their movement testifies to the unalterable order established and decreed for them by God in eternity. Standing squarely in the tradition inherited from the Old Testament, the Sectaries, like Jesus and his followers, subscribe to the basic conviction that purpose and order control the world and man.

Having asserted that God is the absolute sovereign, the Sectaries must account for the reality of evil and wickedness in the world. Since they were convinced that God had preordained all events and had foreknowledge of men's actions, the prophetic view of evil as originating in the heart of man was no longer tenable. The Iranian system of cosmic-ethical dualism provided the answer and for its inclusion in their theological views they could find justification in

⁸ The translation is that of T. H. Gaster in *The Dead Sea Scriptures*, pp. 123-25.

the Hebraic tradition. In the book of Isaiah, the prophet had declared that God formed light and created darkness and made weal and woe (Is. 45:7). In a more recent book, Daniel, the author was driven to the conclusion that the political-religious conflict of the Maccabean era was fundamentally a superhuman one, a battle between angelic powers. The struggle between good and evil thus took on cosmic dimensions. Out of the combination of Iranian dualism and later Hebraic thought, the Sectaries derived their own peculiar system of cosmic-ethical dualism. The problem was most fully considered in the Manual of Discipline (3:13-4:26) and so stated as to affirm both God's sovereignty and his foreknowledge. God created two spirits, that of truth and light and that of error and darkness, to have dominion over men. He decreed from eternity that some men would be ruled by the spirit of darkness and that others would be governed by the spirit of light. While the spirit of darkness and error had complete mastery over the sons of error, it also tried to lead all the sons of righteousness astray. However, the attempt would be thwarted because the "God of Israel and his angel of truth" would intervene to aid all the sons of light. The task of the spirit of light and truth was to shine in the heart of man, lead him in the path of righteousness, endow him with understanding, wisdom, compassion, and love for all the sons of truth, and help him remain pure in the world of evil. God had himself intended the two spirits to have equal power during the present era, in order that men might know good and evil. However, in the final period of the conflict God's sovereignty and justice would be apparent, for he would destroy those whom he eternally hated, the spirit of darkness and all his followers.

Apocalyptic documents familiar to the Sectaries, if not written by them, contribute to an understanding of the origin and the role of these conflicting spiritual forces. In the book of Jubilees and the book of Enoch, the increase of sin and wickedness is explained by a dangerous combination of earthly and supramundane powers. Before the Deluge, God's angels came to earth where they were enticed by the beauty of the daughters of men. Their progeny became giants and corrupted the whole race of men. Thereby sin came into

the world with overpowering force, because the corruption of evil spiritual beings had enhanced men's love of lawlessness. From now on, a demonic host ruled by the prince of demons intruded in men's affairs with malicious intent. The archenemy of God, called Belial, Beliar, Satan, or Mastema, co-operated with the Egyptian sorcerers of Moses' day to thwart the heroic efforts of those who endeavored to remain faithful to the power of good and of righteousness. Pitted against the powers of darkness were God's loyal angels, who observed his laws continuously and fought against the powers of evil for the deliverance of righteous men. To meet the challenge and the threat of evil the spiritual forces of good formed a well-organized society under the leadership of exceptional individual angels or groups of angels. Among the highest ranking were the angels of sanctification and the angels of the presence who had been created on the first day of creation to reveal God's will to men. In these apocalyptic works, as well as in documents from Qumran, the angelic hosts are very much involved in the struggle of good and evil and their involvement directly affects the course of men's lives.

As has been frequently pointed out, the struggle between the two rival groups of powers is not primarily a cosmic-mythical conflict or even a conflict of matter against spirit, but rather a conflict of good against evil with cosmic dimensions.⁹ This understanding of the problem of evil and of God's sovereignty, therefore, continues the Hebraic tradition and, from the point of view of the new Qumran perspectives, was a necessary modification of that tradition. By asserting that God had created the two spirits and had defined their

⁹ The affinities of this ethical dualism with the Iranian dualistic system and the modifications of that system required to adapt it to a Jewish outlook have been frequently pointed out. The discussion of the significance of the two opposing spirits has recently stressed the cosmological-mythical or the spiritual-ethical character of the conflict. See M. Burrows, *More Light*, pp. 280-84, K. Schubert, *Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer*, pp. 57-61, and the article of W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl (New York, 1956), pp. 157-82. Davies concludes that Paul's use of the terms "flesh" and "spirit" are more clearly understood against the background of Qumran dualistic thought, but that Paul's understanding of the conflict is not entirely dependent upon it or fully explained by it.

powers, the Sectaries were able to explain the magnitude of wickedness during the present era and at the same time declare that even wickedness was a demonstration of God's sovereign power.

The conclusion that evil could enhance God's power may have been awesome to contemplate, but still more so for the Sectaries was the thought of their own election by God. The purpose of this election was not to exalt the community but again rather to point to God's glory, as the following quotation from a Psalm of Thanksgiving indicates:

Through me hast Thou illumined
the faces of full many,
and countless be the times
Thou hast shown Thy power through me.
For Thou hast made known unto me
Thy deep, mysterious things,
hast shared Thy secret with me
and so shown forth Thy power;
and before the eyes of full many
this wonder stands revealed,
that Thy glory may be shown forth,
and all living know of Thy power.¹⁰

Although the psalmist, in this passage, indicates that he has been illumined to understand the mysterious ways of God, at the same time he holds that no one can fully comprehend them:

And there is none beside Thee
to controvert Thy plan;
none to understand all Thy holy thought,
none to gaze into the depths of Thy secrets,
none to perceive all Thy wonders
and the might of Thy power.¹¹

These quotations would seem to explain a number of problems inherent in the Sect's predestinarian view, which can almost be called predeterminism. The Sectaries were convinced that they were

¹⁰ The translation is that of T. H. Gaster in *The Dead Sea Scriptures*, p. 145.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 121-22.

utterly unworthy to count themselves among the redeemed. For salvation, then, they could only abandon themselves to God's grace and mercy and praise him for their election to the community of the saints. Such a view of election would seem to lessen the need for man's striving after righteousness. Actually the opposite conclusion was drawn, for the Sectaries were remarkably intense in the attempt to be righteous. Their doctrine of election did not alter, as it did for Paul, the relation of good works and salvation. For the Sectaries, good works were still a precondition for salvation. The quotations indicate that the Qumran solution is this: God works in mysterious ways, many of which he has made known to us. Election to salvation does not lead to irresponsibility but to a more intense recognition of its obligations. Therefore we must work for our salvation as though we merited it.

It requires no elaborate argument to demonstrate that, like the Qumran Sect, the early Church accepted the Old Testament tradition that makes the world and human life subject to the divine will and providence. The word of Jesus about the "two for a penny" sparrows, not one of which falls to the ground without the Father's will (Matt. 10:29) and about God making his sun to shine upon just and unjust alike (Matt. 5:45) will more than suffice. So far as the problem of evil is concerned, the New Testament clearly reflects the tendency illustrated at Qumran to personalize the powers of evil under such names as Satan, Belial, and the prince of this world. But light and darkness are set over against each other categorically only in the Fourth Gospel, where the terms denote two orders of being, each with dynamic characteristics, but not two spirits. It is quite likely that John arrived at this understanding of the two orders with the help of the dualism familiar from Qumran, but the suggestion that God created both the light and the darkness is missing. The word in the prologue of the Fourth Gospel about the light shining in the darkness (Jn. 1:5) suggests, rather, that the darkness came into being before the creation of the world by virtue of some law of opposites, as though the fact that the Word had begun to manifest itself as light had brought darkness into being as its contraposite.

Paul also comes close to the dualism of the Qumran Sectaries, but for him the power that opposes the holy Spirit is sin. Sin is indeed a demonic force, as Romans 7:7-12 clearly indicates, but sin and the holy Spirit are not quite as much of a pair of opposites as are the spirit of light and the spirit of darkness at Qumran. Indeed, sin derives from Adam and, dwelling in the flesh, represents the accumulated potential of thousands of years of sinning. Now the Sectaries too found Adam's sin fraught with significance. By his sin, they believed, Adam had polluted Eden, one of the three holy places of the world, and the process of polluting had continued since that time, leading in these last days to the pollution of the site of the holy Temple. One of the functions of the Sect and of the coming age was to purify the world and the Temple of this pollution. Paul too looks forward to the return of the world to conditions as they existed in Paradise before the Fall (Romans 8:18-22), while, incidentally, declaring that God himself had cursed the earth because of Adam's sin. But he has a new conception of how this return is to be brought about. For him, as we learn especially from I Cor. 15:20-28, human history revolves about two persons, Adam and Christ, the second Adam. As in Adam all died, so in Christ, the second Adam, all shall be made alive. Here as at Qumran the process by which everything returns to the state of being subject to God reaches its conclusion only at the end of time. But the second Adam himself stands inside the framework of history, the process by which he subjects all things to the divine rule has already begun, and the Christian believer exemplifies, shares, and rejoices in the new order. This gives the Christian conception of the struggle with the forces of evil a much more optimistic character than that of the Qumran Sectaries.

As for the subject of election, there is in Romans a passage (8:29-30) which, when divorced from its larger context (8:18-39), leads to the conclusion that Paul believed in rigid predestination quite as the Qumran Sect did. The passage as a whole, however, bears not upon the question of the certainty of election but on the subject of hope and the assurances for that hope. **Man in his weakness and impotence needs such assurances.** One assurance is that

the Spirit helps man in his infirmities, which are so great that he is unable and incompetent even to pray for himself. So the Spirit prays through him and for him, making intercession for man on man's behalf. The second cause for assurance is the realization that behind the affairs of men there is a power that controls, orders, and directs men's destiny. That power is the love of God and the destiny is the unfolding of a pattern that is rooted in God's foreknowledge and foreordination but includes also a call to and a response by the individual. Since assurance of salvation is anchored in God's providence, Paul concludes, man need no longer be afraid of any hostile force. The statement, therefore, is not primarily theological but rather hortatory in character. Hence it does not imply the exclusion of some from salvation, as at Qumran, but more properly the hope that all will experience salvation through Christ. Paul's doctrine of grace, as we shall see in a later chapter, does reflect the Sectararies' profound sense of man's total unworthiness and inability to save himself. But Paul was able to resolve the difficulty that confronted him on this score by changing the relation of good works and salvation. No longer were good works the precondition of salvation but the resultant activity of the one who through Christ has already been redeemed.

Even in New Testament times the Christian views on election and predestination began to take a more dogmatic turn. In John 3: 17-21, as we have already seen, the evangelist has shifted the moment of decision from the impending judgment to the incarnation. According to the other evangelists, Jesus came to show men the need of making a decision before the eschatological consummation took place. He asked for an act of will on man's part to repent and dedicate himself to seek entrance into the Kingdom when it came. If men refused, it meant outer darkness for them. The Fourth Evangelist, however, regards the decision as one already made when Jesus became incarnate. His appearance automatically accomplished the salvation of the good and the judgment of the evil. No act of will, such as repentance suggests, can change the situation, and hence this evangelist has no doctrine of repentance. Paul's teaching on predestination has here been taken to imply that man is what he is: the good come to the light and the evil have no hope.

Comparison of the eschatology of the Qumran Sect and of the early Church in the few basic areas considered here has revealed many similarities and points of contact.¹² There is the fundamental matter of the pattern working itself out in history through a succession of periods; there are the powers of evil making their final attempt to thwart God's purposes and the divinely appointed powers and agencies upholding God's cause; there is the thought that in the last days even the righteous will suffer violence at the hands of the hostile forces; there are apocalyptic visions of the final holocaust; and there is the thought of the divine election, the judgment, and the return to the conditions of Paradise, when all is finally again under God's direct control. All this stems basically from the Old Testament tradition and there is no reason why, within this framework, the eschatological expectation of the Qumran Sectaries may not have helped to mold and make more vital the expectations of the early Church. But there are also many differences, the tendency of the early Church to simplify or subordinate procedures for calculating times and seasons, to adopt new patterns of expression as it came into new cultural contexts, to discard the oppressive sense of being alone in a hostile world, and the corollary of vindictiveness toward that world, to open the doors to the redemption of the many, and to find salvation already in many ways a present reality.

Perhaps the most interesting feature of the comparison is the way in which points of similarity and contact that were there at the outset tend to disappear, while others only emerge as the thought of the early Church develops. Behind this phenomenon may lie factors of transmission, of the interruption of communications, of the survival and of the repristination of ideas that the evidence available for the history of the early Church is not sufficient to permit us to understand. But the importance of the process itself is not to be measured in these terms only. It needs to be understood also as the result of a liberating force that made itself felt in the life of the early Christian community, that never lost its effect, and that creates the basic contrast between the static eschatology of Qumran

¹² For a further discussion, see, e.g., F. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (New York, 1958), pp. 146-53.

and the tendency of the early Church to draw ever new patterns around a single fixed point. This force was implicit in the person and teaching of Jesus himself, as the several aspects of the development in Christian eschatology show. Given Jesus and his preaching of the Kingdom, it was possible for the Church to react to the tradition in any number of ways, to adapt, to invent, or to go back to first beginnings, as circumstances might warrant. Indeed, if the variety of eschatological views expressed in the New Testament is any criterion, the reactions may have been more numerous and diverse than we have any way of knowing.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Hope in the Redemptive Work of the Messiah

Periods of despair and discouragement, particularly after the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., evoked from Israel's poets the hope for an ideal figure, a descendant from the line of David who would again bring peace, justice, security, and stability. Under his rule "people who sat in darkness" would see a great light, a light which would dispel gloom and bring joy to the despondent. Then the yoke of captivity would be broken and the boots of warriors tramping in battle be burned as fuel for the fire. Of the many expressions of hope that were penned, the most familiar is that found in Isaiah 9:

For to us a child is born,
to us a son is given;
and the government will be upon his shoulder,
and his name will be called
"Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God,
Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace."
Of the increase of his government and of peace
there will be no end,
upon the throne of David, and over his kingdom,
to establish it, and to uphold it
with justice and righteousness
from this time forth and for evermore.
The zeal of the Lord of hosts will do this.¹

The Spirit of the Lord would endow this supreme ruler with wisdom and understanding, knowledge and the fear of the Lord (Is.

¹ Is. 9:5-7.

11:2). This Messiah, from the root of Jesse, would alter the evil lot of men and bring such harmony in the world of nature that the wolf would lie down with the lamb and a child play over the hole of an asp. The remnant of Israel, now scattered among the nations, would return to their land with singing, for God through his Messiah would establish Israel as a righteous, peaceful, and prosperous nation, a model admired by all the peoples of the earth. God himself would go out in search of the lost, the straying, and the crippled of his flock and would lead them to their own land to be ruled by a shepherd appointed by him from the royal house of David. Thus God, according to Ezekiel, declared that he would be Israel's God and his servant David would be the prince among them (Ezek. 34: 24). To be sure, the redeeming work of the Messiah, compared with that of God himself, was not a prominent feature of national restoration for authors of the Old Testament documents. However, it was an element of the tradition which assumed importance for certain groups of Jews.² These hopes, together with the Mosaic Law, the covenant promises, prophetic oracles, and the Temple, with its sacrificial system of worship, were a part of Israel's legacy inherited by the Qumran Sect and the early Church.

Since in the documents of the Sectaries one finds no desire for the re-establishment of the Israelite nation as a political entity, but a hope for the founding of a purified holy of holies which would make atonement for the land and render to the wicked their recompense, it is obvious that the Sectaries had modified the traditional hope for a personal Messiah. Indeed they looked forward to the coming, not of one messianic figure, but of two, the anointed ones of Aaron and of Israel (DSD 9:8-11). While the Sectaries viewed themselves as fulfilling Ezekiel's requirements for the everlasting community of those who kept God's ordinances and hoped for the appearance of a Messiah, they added a second messianic figure, who would come from the line of Aaron. The members of the eternal covenant were to discipline themselves by the rules of the covenant and be judged by the laws of the Mosaic code during the period be-

² For the various messianic concepts and titles in later Jewish thought, see S. Mowinkel, *Han Som Kommer* (København, 1951), trans. G. W. Anderson, *He That Cometh* (New York, 1956), pp. 280-93.

tween the death of the Teacher of Righteousness and the appearance of the Messiahs of Aaron and of Israel. When God would come in judgment, victory would be theirs because the swords of the two Messiahs would smite the false shepherd and his sheep and rescue the poor of the flock who had obediently and willingly heeded God's words (Dam. Doc. 7:21).

The references to the messianic figures in the Qumran documents first recovered from the caves are meager, tantalizing, and, as might be expected, much discussed.³ Fragments of Scrolls subsequently found in Cave 4 have added significant new information on this subject.⁴ These fragments stress the importance of the Davidic Messiah whom God will establish upon his throne to rule with power and justice in the new age. Interestingly, this Davidic Messiah will not only receive his royal garments and crown from a priest but will also be guided in his judgment by priestly instruction. Furthermore, as Allegro pointed out in his comments upon this material, the main Qumran interest, even in these passages, is "not so much 'messianic' as eschatological." Two inferences may be drawn from these facts: first, that the Messiah's redemptive role in the soteriological drama, as they saw it, was a minor one, and, second, that the descendants of Zadok at Qumran found value in the person and work of the Messiah particularly insofar as he was guided by priestly authority. What was said in the previous chapter about the range of the Sectaries' interest in the Old Testament supports the first of these conclusions. The second conclusion, that the Davidic Messiah's role is delimited ecclesiastically, finds further support in documents previously known and now to be associated with the

³ Burrows not only appraises the various aspects of this debate but also calls attention to endeavors made to fill out the sketchy messianic views of the Sectaries by use of questionable passages. See *More Light* (New York, 1958), pp. 297-323. Recently scholars have warned against the attempt to reduce the messianic hope of Qumran to a single concept and have suggested a diversity of view (Morton Smith, "What Is Implied by the Variety of Messianic Figures?" *IBL*, LXXVIII [1959], 66-72, and J. Liver, "The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Commonwealth," *HTR*, LII (1959), 149-85).

⁴ John Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *IBL*, LV (1956), 174-87.

Sect because of their appearance among the literary fragments in the Qumran caves.⁵

As Kuhn and others have indicated, the Qumran doctrine of two Messiahs is best understood in the light of references to these two eschatological leaders in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. The author of the Testament of Levi, though primarily preoccupied with the question of Levi's position in the divine plan for Israel, was also concerned with God's appointment of two of the patriarchs to act as his unique agents. Levi and Judah would each have an ideal descendant who would follow the example of his illustrious ancestor. They would both have the task of making certain aspects of God's nature and will known to men. The projected Levi of the future would declare the mysteries regarding God's redemption of Israel; the projected Judah would act as an agent for God's appearance among men (Test. of Levi 2:10-11).

The author of this document implies, but does not clearly state, that Levi's position is superior to Judah's. Levi, who was taught the laws of God by Isaac and the angels, was designated by God at the age of nineteen to be the first priest of Israel and became, therefore, the great and perfect priest who could speak to God as Father (Test. of Levi 17:2). Furthermore, in the Testament of Levi, it is predicted that from Levi's day on no comparable mediator of God's saving will for men would appear in Israel until God raised up a new priest from Levi's line to fulfil the functions of the priesthood in the new age (Test. of Levi 18). The extravagant praise of Levi indicates that the author's purpose is to exalt the Levitical priesthood. No representative from the patriarchal age could claim more of divine favor than Levi, the priest of God. Through a vision, he learned of his own superiority over the other sons of Jacob and of

⁵ K. G. Kuhn was among the first to associate the references in the Scrolls to the two Messiahs with appropriate passages found in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs ("Die beiden Messias Aarons und Israels," *NTS*, I [1954/55], 168-80). For further discussion of the problem, see L. H. Silberman, "The Two 'Messiahs' of the Manual of Discipline," *VT*, V (1955), 77-82; W. S. LaSor, "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," *VT*, VI (1956), 425-29; and K. Schubert, "Zwei Messiasse aus dem Regelbuch von Chirbet Qumran," *Judaica*, XI (1955), 216-35; also J. Liver, "The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs," n. 3 above.

the special task required of the ideal priestly figure who would come from his line. Under an angel's guidance, Levi was taken through the seven spheres of heaven to discover the divine plan for his own mission on earth and the nature and organization of the supernatural world. The first sphere had been prepared for the wicked upon the earth, who would be condemned to a place of fire, snow, and ice. In the second sphere the hosts of the heavenly army were mustering their forces for the war against the spirits of deceit and against Beliar. Finally in the highest, or the seventh, sphere he saw the Almighty God seated upon his throne and learned that he would stand near the Lord to be his minister. His earthly mission was twofold: to reveal to his people the mysteries of God and to serve as the great pattern of the priesthood for his people until God would appear in Jerusalem. Such divine favor was merited on the grounds of Levi's prayer requesting that he be separated from the iniquities of men. Therefore, God had made him his Son and his Servant to minister throughout eternity in his presence (Test. of Levi 4). For this reason, Levi and his descendants would always be a light of knowledge to Jacob and a sun for Israel.

The exaltation of Levi and of the Levitical priesthood presented a problem to the author of the Testament of Levi, for how could one continue to regard the Levitical priests, particularly the most recent corrupted descendants of Levi, as the chosen representatives of God? They had neither lived up to the example given by Levi himself nor carried out their priestly responsibilities to the people of Israel. The problem was answered by revelation. Levi had been warned that his descendants would disgrace the high office of the priesthood and bring ridicule upon it. But he was also given the promise that in the new age a new priest would arise from his line who would perfectly fulfil the duties of this sacred office. On the basis of this prediction Levi issued an oracular warning to his descendants proclaiming that successive jubilees of years would witness the gradual degeneration of the priestly line and that the last generation of priests would live among men who wished to destroy the light of the Law, set at naught the words of the prophets, persecute righteous men, hate the godly, and take holy things as a jest. Then the veil of the Temple would be rent to uncover their shame,

and the Temple which they had polluted would be destroyed (Test. of Levi 10:3). During these last days all who hated the Levitical priests of Jerusalem would rejoice over their captivity and exile among the Gentiles. In spite of this discouraging vision of future disgrace, Levi attempted to fulfil his priestly responsibility by urging his descendants to fear the Lord with all their hearts and to teach their children the Law. Above all, they must keep themselves from evil. Thus they would bring righteousness to the earth and have treasure in heaven.

Following the pattern intimated in Levi's oracular warning, the author contrasted the disgraceful character of the priests of his day to the ideal of the priesthood. According to Levi's vision, he was to be installed by seven men clothed in white garments who would come to invest him with the robes of his office and would give him the crown of righteousness, the breastplate of understanding, the garment of truth, the plate of faith, and the ephod of prophecy. They would also give him the symbols of his office—the staff of judgment, the olive branch, and the burner of incense. In the ceremony of investiture, he was to be anointed with holy oil, then washed with pure water, fed the most holy food (bread and wine), and robed to serve as priest to the Lord. At this time he was told that he would be the great priest, that his descendants would remain in the priesthood to guard the holy place in Jerusalem, and that, even though his descendants of the last generation would bring dishonor upon the priesthood, God would raise up a new priest from his line (Test. of Levi 8:1–17). What the new priest would accomplish for his people is expressed in the messianic hymn written in his praise and in praise of his rule over the people:

Then shall the Lord raise up a new priest.
 And to him all the words of the Lord shall be revealed;
 And he shall execute a righteous judgment upon the earth for
 a multitude of days.
 And his star shall arise in heaven as of a king,
 Lighting up the light of knowledge as the sun the day,
 And he shall shine forth as the sun on the earth,
 And shall remove all darkness from under heaven,
 And there shall be peace in all the earth.

The heavens shall exult in his days,
 And the earth shall be glad,
 And the clouds shall rejoice;
 And the angels of the glory of the presence of the Lord shall be
 glad in him.
 The heavens shall be opened,
 And from the temple of glory shall come upon him sanctification,
 With the Father's voice as from Abraham to Isaac.
 And the glory of the Most High shall be uttered over him,
 And the spirit of understanding and sanctification shall rest upon
 him.
 For he shall give the majesty of the Lord to His sons in truth
 for evermore;
 And there shall none succeed him for all generations for ever.
 And in his priesthood the Gentiles shall be multiplied in knowl-
 edge upon the earth,
 And enlightened through the grace of the Lord:
 In his priesthood shall sin come to an end,
 And the lawless shall cease to do evil.
 And he shall open the gates of paradise,
 And shall remove the threatening sword against Adam.
 And he shall give to the saints to eat from the tree of life,
 And the spirit of holiness shall be on them.
 And Beliar shall be bound by him,
 And he shall give power to His children to tread upon the evil
 spirits.
 And the Lord shall rejoice in His children,
 And be well pleased in His beloved ones for ever.
 Then shall Abraham and Isaac and Jacob exult,
 And I will be glad,
 And all the saints shall clothe themselves with joy.⁶

While the new priest's star would rise like that of a king, he would come, not to defeat Israel's national enemies, but to remove darkness from the world, to bring peace to the earth, and especially to open the gates of paradise for the saints. In this hymn the poet does not express a hope for the restoration of Israel under the political leadership of the Davidic Messiah from the tribe of Judah but rather the spiritual hopes for a world of righteousness, peace, un-

⁶ Testament of Levi 18:2-14.

derstanding, knowledge, and release from sin and the powers of evil. The whole world will rejoice when the ideal figure appears. The heavens, the earth, the clouds, and the angels of God will join with the holy ones of the land, and with the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and shout for joy because the new priest will have defeated Beliar and his evil host forever.

The inferred superiority of the priestly Messiah is explicitly clarified by testaments of other patriarchs.⁷ According to the relevant passages, God appointed messianic figures from both the tribes of Judah and of Levi. Although Judah received the promise that he would be king in Israel forever and that the king from his family would be like a rising star, the sun of righteousness, and a life-giving fountain, he was also told that the Messiah from Levi would be greater, for God has given him the priesthood. In his testament to his sons, therefore, Judah admits that God gave to him a kingdom and the things of the earth but to Levi he gave the priestly office and the things of heaven. Since heaven is higher than earth, the priesthood of God is higher than the earthly kingdom. The revealing angel declared, therefore, that God had chosen Levi rather than Judah to draw near him, to eat at his table, and to offer him the first fruits of the choice things of the sons of Israel. Furthermore, the Messiah from Levi would deserve a great expression of Israel's gratitude, for Levi and his descendants would devote themselves to the instruction of Israel in the laws and ceremonies and would intercede on their behalf and even die in wars, visible and invisible, to save the people of God's covenant.

Since the Old Testament tradition associated its hopes for restoration with the appearance of one from Jesse's stock, the Sectaries' doctrine of two Messiahs appears to be a unique departure from Old Testament prophecy. One can, however, explain this apparent deviation without difficulty. Since the Sectaries had abandoned all hope of redemption for the vast majority of their own people, they

⁷ Although fragments of only two Testaments, Levi and Naphtali, have been discovered in the Qumran caves, it is probably permissible to use related material from the total document, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. For Burrows' comments on the use of this material, see *More Light*, pp. 308-10.

could not regard the restoration of Israel's political power under the leadership of a Davidic Messiah as desirable. Infinitely more significant for the Sectaries were righteousness, peace, reconciliation with God, and love of the brothers in the covenanted society. These values, in their opinion, might be established more readily under a priestly than under a royal Messiah. They looked forward, therefore, to the time when God would be enthroned as sovereign king in his holy dwelling at Jerusalem and would use the priesthood as the medium through which he could impart his blessings to Israel. However, their training in the promises and laws of the Old Testament made it impossible to rule out the royal messianic figure entirely. Within the tradition itself, namely in the prophecies of Zechariah, they found a solution for their dilemma. According to Zechariah's vision of the two olive branches, there were two anointed ones who stood beside the Lord of the whole earth, Joshua, the anointed of Aaron, and Zerubbabel, the anointed one of David's dynasty (Zech. 4:14; cf. chaps. 3 and 4). This they used to justify their expectation of two Messiahs. Justification for assigning to the priestly Messiah a position of superiority over the Davidic Messiah from Judah may have been derived from Ezekiel's utopian dream for the reorganization of Israel's political and religious life (Ezek. 40-48). According to this scheme, the priest, whom the author of Leviticus called the "anointed" one (Lev. 4:3, 5:16, 6:22), was to exercise authority over the prince of the people (Ezek. 44-46). By developing further these allusions to future leaders in the Old Testament, the Sectaries could well have arrived at their own concepts of the Messiahs' eschatological roles. Since they were not looking for salvation from Israel's enemies, but from wickedness and sin, and from ignorance of and rebellion against God's laws, they placed their greater hope in one who, as the anointed of God, would be able to turn the disobedient hearts of the people back to God and give them eternal peace in God's Kingdom and who would be able to restrain the political ambitions of a Davidic Messiah.

Interestingly, some of John the Baptist's followers apparently thought of him as one who fulfilled the hope for a priestly Messiah. In the nativity stories of John, as they are preserved in Luke's gospel, we read that the "poor" of Israel will rejoice at his birth because

it signifies the arrival of the day of redemption (Luke 1:46-55).⁸ What is said in praise of John as the wonder child (Luke 1:16-17) who would create a prepared people by transforming them into obedient children of God expresses the ideals of deeply pious rural priests. It is not surprising, therefore, that John, as the son of such a priest, could be regarded as fulfilling the hopes of those looking for a Messiah from the tribe of Levi. This does not necessarily imply that John the Baptist had such messianic views or that he thought of himself as fulfilling the promises of a Messiah. But it does suggest the possibility that John, by his mission and message, which stressed in particular both observantism and eschatology, might have attracted certain Sectaries to his circle of followers. To give their allegiance to John would have required a minimal alteration of their hopes for the appearance of a priestly Messiah.

In turning now from the Sectaries and John the Baptist to the early Church, it is unnecessary to rehearse here what has previously been said about Jesus' own vocational consciousness and about the way in which the first community of Christian believers at Jerusalem regarded him. In both instances, it will be recalled, the expectation of a messianic prophet, the prophecies concerning the Suffering Servant, and those about the Son of Man who was to come on the clouds played the major roles. So far as the Sectaries are concerned, it will be clear that for them the Servant was the community of the faithful, not an individual person, and that Daniel's Son of Man does not seem to have interested them at all. There is, therefore, at the very outset a marked difference between the Sectaries and the early Church in messianic doctrine.⁹ Of course the

⁸ For this interpretation of the material in the Lukan nativity stories, see Carl H. Kraeling, *John the Baptist* (New York, 1951), pp. 166-71, 181; see also Luke 3:15.

⁹ While it will not be possible to refer to the full range of literature on studies dealing with Christology, a few recent works may be mentioned: O. Cullmann, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen, 1957), trans. S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall, *The Christology of the New Testament* (Philadelphia, 1959); two books by J. Knox, *Christ the Lord* (New York, 1945) and *Jesus: Lord and Christ* (New York, 1958); two books by V. Taylor, *The Names of Jesus* (New York, 1953), and *The Person of Christ in*

difference must not be overstated. The early Palestinian church, according to Acts 2:27, found useful for its purposes 'the passage, Psalm 16:8-11, which speaks of the Holy One not seeing corruption and believed to see in Jesus the expected Davidic Messiah. Indeed, this belief is further developed and supported by Matthew's genealogy (Matt. 1:1-17) and in the words "thou Son of David" by which Jesus is addressed in incidents of gospel story (e.g. Mk. 10:47). It is also clear that in associating Jesus with the Davidic Messiah the early Church tended to set aside, as the Sectaries had done, the national and political function traditionally performed by the David of the messianic era. Yet there is nothing to show that the Church had any conception of the priestly function of Jesus Christ until much later and in a much different intellectual context, when the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews took up the theme (Heb. 4:14). This is a real measure of the differences existing at the outset between the two groups.

The further development of christology in the early Church serves only to underline and increase the differences already observed. This development is, of course, associated with, and in large measure explained by, the transition of the Christian faith from Palestine to the larger Mediterranean world, to Syria, Asia, Greece, and Italy and conjures up the names of Paul and of the author of the Fourth Gospel. But traces of the development can also be seen in the circles and among the persons responsible for the transmission of the synoptic tradition.

The First Evangelist, Mark, already reflects several changes in the thought of the later Palestinian Christians. Some of them are worthy of note. Now the early Church at Jerusalem, according to Acts, construed Jesus' resurrection as the event by which he was declared to be and was installed as Messiah (Acts 2:36, 13:30-33). Mark, however, shifts Jesus' messianic appointment to the moment of his baptism (Mk. 1:9-11). He also incorporates in his gospel a number of episodes that represent a type of christological thought fundamentally different from the Jewish. Such are the miracle sto-

New Testament Teaching (New York, 1958); and G. V. Jones, *Christology and Myth in the New Testament* (London, 1956).

ries from the Lake of Galilee region, the Stilling of the Storm (Mk. 4:35-41), the Walking on the Water (Mk. 6:45-52), and the Feeding of the Multitude (Mk. 6:30-44). These, and particularly the first two, are epiphany stories and presuppose the ability on Jesus' part to reveal himself as a supernatural being as occasion may suggest. As a type, they belong more to the Hellenistic than to the Jewish world of thought. Somewhere between these worlds belongs the marvelous story of the Transfiguration (Mk. 9:2-8). It has clear associations with Jewish thought, as the presence of Moses and Elijah and a theophany reminiscent of Mount Sinai show, but in Jesus' own transfiguration an equally clear association with the type of epiphany story. The use by Mark of this kind of narrative testifies to the intrusion of a new non-Jewish factor into the christological thought of the early Church in the Palestinian environment itself. It is not an accident, therefore, that we find Mark also making room in his gospel for the title Son of God (Mk. 1:1, *passim*), which gathers together the sum total of the impressions created by his narratives and which was certainly more intelligible to Greek readers than the Jewish term Son of Man.

The evangelists of the First and Third Gospels retained the basic elements of the Markan pattern but modified it in various ways. One change was the assertion that Jesus became God's Son, not at the time of his resurrection or of his baptism, but at the moment of his conception. The role of the holy Spirit in the stories of Jesus' birth has its counterpart in the story of the first creation, when God's Spirit hovered over the deep to impart to unformed chaos the power to generate life. In the nativity stories, the Spirit again manifests its creative power by creating in the womb of Mary the Messiah who was to be the Savior of men's lives.

Matthew's nativity story has a thoroughly traditional Jewish-Christian ring. It heralds Jesus' birth as the advent of the long expected Israelite Messiah, the great hero of the house of David who would lead his people out of darkness. He has come to save them from their sins and to be the shepherd of his people, Israel. The strongly nationalistic and anti-Herodian details of the Matthean nativity story reflect the christological affirmations appropriate to a moderately conservative Jewish Christianity. The portrayal of Jesus

as the new Moses and the messianic teacher of righteousness in the main section of the gospel further indicates that this evangelist has remained within the boundaries of Jewish messianism.

Luke's nativity story, especially since it is followed by an "orderly account" of Jesus' life, tends to remove from the reader the constraints of Jewish thought. The birth is announced to humble shepherds as good news to all the people (Luke 2:10). The newly born Savior will bring about peace on earth among men of good will and thus introduce the golden age. There are possible connections here with Vergil's *Fourth Eclogue*. Luke applies the same universalizing treatment to his portrayal of Jesus in the remainder of his gospel. Jesus, like a Greek philosopher, uses the opportunity of his last meal with his disciples to speak of the duties of humble service to one's fellow men (Luke 22:25-27). As a righteous man, rather than as the Son of God, Jesus dies a martyr's death and suffers that he might enter into his glory (Luke 24:26).

The two nativity stories, of Matthew and of Luke, express divergent points of view, the one predominantly nationalistic and Jewish and the other predominantly universalistic and Hellenistic. But it is important to note that Luke's nativity story incorporates and is interwoven with that of John the Baptist. The latter is strongly dependent upon Old Testament prototypes. The fusion illustrates an important fact, namely that the synoptic tradition stands with its feet in two worlds. The first three evangelists try to bridge the gap between Palestine and the Western world and, fortunately for us, did not produce a unified conception. This was done before and after them by men like Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel.

Among the earlier leaders of Christian thought, Paul produced the most profound interpretation of the nature and significance of Jesus' person and work. As has already been noted, Paul shared with the early Church and with the Sectaries the traditional interpretation of history as a great drama beginning with the fall of Adam and ending with the defeat of the evil ruler of the present age. He also shared the belief with the early Church that Jesus came in fulfilment of God's promises concerning one whom he would send to deliver his covenanted people, that Jesus would return as the Son of Man in glory at the end of the age to judge the wicked

and to justify those who had faith in him, and that salvation could be found only in Jesus and in his divinely given name. But Paul seems also to have found that these Jewish formulas had certain limitations for his Gentile converts. It required a knowledge of the Old Testament and of the Jewish tradition to understand them, and this knowledge Gentile converts did not have and could acquire only gradually. New ways of speaking about the nature and function of Christ were needed. To interpret Christ's nature and being, Paul took recourse to a world of thought with which Greeks and Hellenized Jews were thoroughly familiar, the world of pre-existent spiritual realities, of types and forms materialized in the natural world. Christ, Paul said, was of that world, the pre-existent Son in the image of the invisible God, who having been in the form of God emptied himself and took on the form of a servant (Col. 1: 15-20; Phil. 2:5-11). Naturally, this was not the only way Paul spoke of Christ, but this is the new element that enters the christological picture at this time. To interpret the function of Christ, Paul took recourse to the propitiation and redemption ideas, which were intelligible to Jews and Greeks alike. But he held out to his converts the possibility of participating in the death and resurrection of Christ through ritual performance and thereby obtaining the assurance of salvation, quite as in the mystery cults (Rom. 3:24-25, 6:3-8; Col. 2:12). For the pre-existent Christ who had abased himself, had accomplished the redemption, and was now enthroned in heaven at God's right hand, Paul needed a new title. The title "Lord," used of God in Jewish tradition and of various deities in pagan religion, apparently came closest to what Paul was trying to affirm about Jesus. Indeed, Paul believed that God had himself given this name to Jesus (Phil. 2:9). How far this type of christological thought is from anything that would have been intelligible and acceptable to the Qumran Sectaries scarcely needs to be elaborated. Though Paul remained a Jew in many elements of his thinking, his fertile mind was moving rapidly toward a transformation of the drama of redemption that left Palestine, the Temple, the priesthood, the Suffering Servant, and the Son of Man ever further behind. Even the conservative Jewish Christian circles of Palestine found him something of a problem.

Christian thought about the person and work of the redeemer had still to move forward another step before the New Testament development came to an end. This step is reflected in the work of the Fourth Evangelist. The impact of Paul's thinking upon this author affected his conception of what a gospel as a record of Jesus' deeds and words should be. Hence he began his gospel with Christ himself in his pre-existent state and not with God's appointment of Jesus as his Son, whether at baptism (Mark) or at his birth (Matthew and Luke). His gospel, therefore, is not a gospel about Jesus, but his gospel is Jesus. Although he used the narrative form of a gospel to convey his ideas, his interest is more in ideas than in events. He adopted the gospel form to show that his ideas concerned an historical person. But his use of episodes from Jesus' life indicates that they were primarily the vehicle for the expression of spiritual truth and that the Jesus of history was the revelation of an eternal and transcendent divine reality.

The author began his gospel with a hymn of the Church to Christ—the one contained in the familiar “prologue” (Jn. 1:1–16). When the evangelist's prose additions are omitted, the hymn can be seen to describe four aspects of the eternal Word's relationship: to God; to the created world; to the historical situation in Israel before the Word became flesh; and, finally, to the world of men after he became flesh.

In the beginning was the Word
And the Word was with God,
And the Word was God.
He was in the beginning with God.

All things were made through him,
And without him was not anything made.
As to created existence in it, he [the Word] was life.
And the life was the light of men.
The light shines in the darkness,
And the darkness has not overcome it.

He was in the world,
And the world was made through him,
And the world knew him not.

He came to his own,
 And his own people received him not.

 And the Word became flesh
 And dwelt among us
 Full of grace and truth.
 And we beheld his glory,
 Glory as of the only Son from the Father,
 And from his fullness have we all received,
 Grace upon grace.

It is easy to recognize the author's debt to Paul, coming to expression in his affirmations that Christ was pre-existent, that he was involved in the creation of the world, and that the experience of grace upon grace is for the believer the result and meaning of his self-revelation. More important, however, are the new features of christological thought that appear here, among which three may be singled out for brief comment. These are, the new designation applied to the pre-existent Christ, the circumstances of his relation to the created order, and how his incarnation is interpreted.

By the use of the designation "Word" for the pre-existent Christ, the evangelist moves to within a stone's throw of an important and powerful set of ideas proper to Greek speculative thought. These are the ideas clustering about the postulated principle of "reason" intermediate between ultimate being and the created order and indeed itself inherent in the created order. The application to Christ of a designation conjuring up these associations was of the greatest importance for the Christian apologists of the second and third centuries, forming the basis of the Logos christology by which they claimed for Christianity a large part of Greek wisdom. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus as the Word is not yet the Logos of the philosophers. Rather, he is that entity in the Godhead that represents God's self-revealing nature and tendency. But for this a new term has been developed, and the development proved momentous.

The new conception of the process of incarnation is offered in the fourth stanza of the poem. What the words seem to say is that the pre-existent, divine spiritual being, Christ, transformed himself into a human being of flesh and blood. So understood, the statement ex-

presses an obvious contradiction, since if two things are said to be different they are not and do not become the same. The Fourth Gospel provides other examples of such logical contradictions as part of the Christian faith, for instance in Jesus' word about being born again (Jn. 3:5-9), over which the scholarly Nicodemus sadly shakes his head. Generations of Christians have wrestled with the process of the incarnation, trying to formulate a reasonable statement about it. With such efforts the Fourth Evangelist would not have concerned himself. His faith told him that in the historical Jesus he was dealing with a unique person. All the attempts that had been made to explain this uniqueness reasonably, whether through adoption by God, procreation by the holy Spirit, or the self-emptying and exchange of form by the pre-existent Christ himself, seemed unsatisfactory. Where nothing reasonable satisfied the demands of faith, the only recourse was to the unreasonable, the contradictory, and the paradox. Here that recourse is apparently taken, and here the "foolishness" that outsiders had seen, for instance in Paul's preaching of the crucified (I Cor. 1:23), is triumphantly proclaimed as a necessary and fundamental feature of faith as such. Clearly nothing could be further removed from the thought of the Qumran Sectaries about the redemptive work of the Messiah than the way that work is undergirded by the Fourth Evangelist.

The third feature of the Fourth Evangelist's christological thought to which attention should be directed here is that of the circumstances of the pre-existent Christ's relation to the created order. These circumstances are such as to cause darkness to appear when he begins to manifest himself as light (Jn. 1:5). Attention has already been directed above to the relation between the dualism implied in these words and that of the Qumran Sectaries, and to the bearing of the statement upon the Fourth Evangelist's conception of the origin of evil. Here three further points have briefly to be mentioned. The first is that the dualism suggested in the Prologue is carried through the entire gospel. The terminology varies from page to page as truth and deceit, life and death, love and hate interchange with light and darkness, but the antithesis is the same in every instance. The second point is that the antitheses are associated

with the operation of supernatural forces on both sides. On the one side stands the Son who is from above (Jn. 3:31), who is the light of the world (Jn. 9:5), who is the truth and the life (Jn. 14:6). On the other stands the devil who has nothing to do with, and in fact denies, both life and truth and therefore is properly their destroyer, hence a murderer and a liar (Jn. 8:44-45). The third point is that the operation of these forces sets over against each other certain closely-knit groups. One such is the group called "the Jews" from which Jesus and an "Israelite" such as Nathanael can be distinguished. The group is therefore not the Jewish people as a historical entity but rather the body of those who do not believe. Over against the Jews stands the group of those who do believe, whom Christ has chosen, and who come to him. It is they to whom the words of life apply and for whose protection from the evil one Jesus' prayer provides (Jn. 17:14).

The dualism of the Fourth Evangelist, therefore, though speculative rather than substantial, works itself out quite as at Qumran, in process through supernatural beings and in product by establishing restricted and opposed groups. The conflict of persons and personalized powers in the redemptive process as the Fourth Evangelist has portrayed it is, of course, part of the tradition that he inherited from the Palestinian church, and which is as much primitively Christian as it is Sectarian. The restrictiveness in his conception of the result of the process, however, is not primitively Christian. It may be something borrowed, for instance from the Sectaries, or something to which the adoption of a dualistic premise inevitably led.

Two general observations are suggested by what has been said above about the Christian and the Sectaries' hope in the redemptive work of the Messiah. The first is that, whereas information concerning the Sectaries' two Messiahs has to be gleaned with care from incidental references found here and there in the relatively large body of Qumran literature, the much smaller New Testament literature is primarily and almost continuously concerned precisely with the person and work of the messianic deliverer. The second observation is that, whereas the Sectaries' picture of the re-

demptive agents and their work was largely traditional and thoroughly homogeneous, the Christian conception varied from person to person and from place to place. The earliest formulations were inspired by the biblical tradition but not always by the parts of that tradition favored at Qumran. The later formulations responded to personal experiences or utilized forms of thought available in the larger contemporary environment. The wealth of the associations helped to make doubly impressive the function of the figure that had inspired them.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Moral Responsibility and the Hope of Redemption

One inheritance received by both the Qumran Sect and the early Church from their common Jewish heritage was the traditional association of affirmation and exhortation. These two elements had become accepted features of Hebraic thought from the days of Amos on. Overwhelmed by a sense of God's righteousness, Amos proclaimed that God must act in the affairs of men according to his character. A righteous God demanded of men a response in kind, and the urgency with which the demand was presented made it impossible for men to treat it lightly. The demands were of crucial importance for men's lives: "Seek good and not evil, that you may live" (Amos 5:14). Throughout the course of Israel's tradition the understanding of God's will and nature had determined the character of man's response to God and the human situation and, so associated, these two basic themes were fundamental in the Old Testament message of redemption.

The theocratic community created in the post-exilic period in perpetuation of this tradition and for the fulfilment of these demands came under the control of the Hellenistic monarchies in the late fourth century. The new relationship quickly became a threat to the heritage not only because it accelerated the tempo of secularization in daily life but also because it involved increasing obligations to the new overlords that had pagan religious overtones. From the threat on this score during the period of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Jewish community seemed to have been rescued by the Maccabean

revolt. But the new Jewish priest-kings were soon themselves drawn into the vortex of power politics and secularism, and once more the nation's moral responsibilities under the covenant relationship became an issue. It was from among the "pious" who reacted against the regime of the secularized Jewish priesthood that the Qumran Sect was born and recruited. The same issue of national and individual responsibilities to the Lord of the covenant created at a later date the Pharisaic movement and lay at the root of the Baptist and Christian efforts. For a comparison and understanding of the several groups and individuals it is, therefore, of no small importance to inquire how they formulated and proposed to discharge the moral responsibilities which the hope of divine redemption imposed upon them.

How the Qumran Sect, in literal fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah 40:3, determined to prepare in the wilderness the way of the Lord has been set forth in chapter ii. Here only a brief word need be added on that subject to bring out the importance of Israel's first stay in the wilderness for the achievement of the moral purposes. Some light is shed on this point by the book of Jubilees, which the Sectaries read at Qumran, and in which the history of the patriarchal and Mosaic periods is reworked. According to its author, God commanded Moses that he write down every word spoken to him on Mount Sinai in order that the future generations of Israel might neither be doubtful about nor ignorant of God's specific commands. To guarantee that the community would not forget the Law, God decreed that it should remain in the wilderness for forty years and devote itself there to the study of the Law (Jub. 50:4). By keeping the community separate from the Canaanites who lived in the land promised to Israel, God had intended that his people might so learn and practice these ordinances that they would be able to resist the allurements of pagan beliefs and practices. Although this was God's intention for his covenanted people, he warned Moses that the nation would forget all the commandments, would walk in the way of the Gentiles, would pollute his dwelling place in Jerusalem, would forsake the laws regarding the festivals of the covenant and the keeping of the Sabbath. Then, with an apparent reference to the Qumran community itself, the author pre-

dicted a time when the Gentiles would show neither mercy nor compassion and would rise up violently against Jacob and Israel. At this time, when Israel had again been scattered among the Gentiles and had again suffered as she had under Egyptian domination, a community of men would begin to study the laws, seek the commandments, and return to the path of righteousness (Jub. 23:26). The Qumran Sect, therefore, retreated to the wilderness in order that its members might study God's first ordinances under the guidance of the Teacher of Righteousness as Israel had studied them at Sinai.

As a community the Sect must separate itself from the men of error and must live apart from pagan corruption for a period which, in their opinion, would last for about forty years (Dam. Doc. Ms. B 20:15). In the wilderness they hoped "to be united as a holy of holies and a house of community for Israel" and to become the community of perfectionists in the Law and thereby to prepare the way for the Lord's coming (DSD 8:20-9:25). In them God would be able to fulfil Jeremiah's prophecy of the new covenant by making them the eternal community of his elect ones, whose hearts he would circumcise, in whom he would create a holy Spirit, and whom he would thoroughly cleanse of their sins. Essentially the Sectaries were not seeking, as a minority group, to transform society but to copy the patterns of an ancient period and thus to bring to fulfilment in their own community the realization of these earlier hopes. As archaists they wanted to preserve the high moral ideals of the past which Israel as a nation had never been able to put into practice.

Dedicated to such high purpose, the Qumran Sect needed first of all to safeguard its communal life. The procedures which it established on this score for admission to the community have been described above. Here it is important to note the emphasis that falls upon an understanding of the demands of the Law for both novice and full member. During the initial period of testing, a master of the Sect instructed the candidate for admission in the meaning of the ordinances of the Law, questioned him about his comprehension of the significance of the Law, and observed his ability to live according to its decrees. If the candidate were granted admission to

the Sect, he then took solemn initiatory vows, expressing the dedication of his life to the Law. At this time the candidate vowed that he would act according to all that God had commanded and would not turn away from him because of any terror or trial caused by the domination of Belial. After taking the vows, the candidate then heard the priests and the Levites pronounce terrifying curses upon all who might have tried to enter the Sect with improper motives. God would put this person's lot in the midst of those who were forever accursed (DSM 1:1-20).

Acceptance into the community of those who sought to purify their knowledge in the truth of God's statutes led to further discipline. All members of the Sect must be examined annually by the community as a whole, and each member must be willing to accept reproof daily for whatever sinful deeds he might have committed intentionally or unintentionally. In fact, it was the duty of each brother out of his love for another member of the Sect to strengthen him in his work of perfection. Concerning minor deviations from the Law, the brothers of the Sect spoke to each other privately without anger, resentment, or pride and were not to bring the matter to the attention of the masters until the erring brother had been personally rebuked (DSD 5:25-6:1). None could accuse another before the superintendent without witnesses. If guilty, then the offender was punished according to the seriousness of his crime. Punishment might be a temporary discipline, such as taking away the privilege of fellowship with other members at the sacred meal, or it might be excommunication from the community (DSD 8:16-19). While every member of the Sect was responsible for maintaining the high standards of the Law, an administrative body of fifteen officials served both as the teachers and enforcers of the commandments and as examples of perfection.

The discipline may seem unduly harsh and rigorous, but the goal which the Sectaries were striving to attain was exceptionally difficult. They were not seeking, as were the Pharisees, to produce individual virtuosi in the study of the Law but were trying instead to create a community whose perfection of understanding and performance of the commandments might surpass all previous achievements in obedience to the dictates of the Law.

The basic nature of man's responsibilities as viewed by the Sectaries is not difficult to describe. It is plainly to observe the demands of the Law of God and no real distinction is made between demands of a ceremonial and non-ceremonial nature. True, the Manual of Discipline echoes the prophetic statements that justice and blameless conduct are of greater importance than the flesh of whole burnt offerings and insists that purification is achieved by repentance rather than water, and atonement by acceptance of God's rule rather than by the blood of a slain victim. Yet, at the same time, the Sect presupposed acceptance of circumcision, was most cautious as regards purity of food and avoidance of physical contamination, and insisted upon the most careful observance of all festivals and of the Sabbath. All that can be said about the relation of ceremonial and non-ceremonial observance is that the moral demands were never lost sight of as the dominant and underlying factors in man's acceptability before God.

The nature of the fundamental moral demands is stated simply and beautifully by the Manual of Discipline in the words, "to keep from all evil and to cling to good works; to act truthfully and righteously and justly on earth" (DSD 1:1-15). Nor is this code of ethics without its social significance. The Manual has many injunctions bearing upon the relations of the brethren to each other and speaks boldly of the "bond of mutual love" between the members of the community. How this bond was regarded may be illustrated from the story of Esau as rewritten by the author of the book of Jubilees.

In the story of Esau, after Isaac had given his word of warning to Jacob and Esau about the true meaning of brotherly responsibility and love, he turned his address to include all men who were brothers by saying: "And love one another, my sons, your brothers, as a man loveth his own soul, and let each seek in what he may benefit his brother and act together on the earth; and let them love each other as their own souls" (Jub. 36:4). Isaac continued his admonition by adding that, if one loves the brother with affection and righteousness and does not desire evil against him, then the loving brother will prosper in all deeds and not be destroyed. But if he plots evil against his brother, then he will be rooted out of the land of the living and his seed will be destroyed by a devouring flame and his name blot-

ted out of the book of life. Esau, according to this story, took the oath of brotherly love but soon declared the oath valueless because it was not grounded in the natural order of things. Hence he broke the oath by saying:

If the boar can change its skin and make its bristles as soft as wool,
Or if it can cause horns to sprout forth on its head like the horns of a stag or of a sheep,
Then shall I observe the tie of brotherhood with thee.¹

The consequence of Esau's wilful disregard of the oath of brotherliness serves as an illustration of what the Sectaries believed would be the dire results of such a flagrant display of moral irresponsibility, for Esau brought death upon himself and disaster upon all who were associated with him. The sons of light, however, had been commanded to love each other as their own souls. Since such a degree of love for the brother was not inherent in human nature, it must be taught as a commandment of God. And, since it was a commandment, it must be obeyed without evasion in daily contacts with the brothers of the Sect. It was not, therefore, a sentimental love, for it expressed itself in teaching the brother, in admonishing him, and in guiding him along the path of understanding. Love served as the bond by which the Sectaries sought to create an acceptable community before God.

Two important features of the understanding of moral responsibility at Qumran require special mention in this connection. The first is that the nature of God's will is explored and clarified by the operation of the human mind. Hence the intense study of Scripture and the procedures for testing and learning their implications at the meetings of the community. The second is that the practical upshot of man's efforts in the ethical sphere, whether he lives a life of righteousness or of perfidy, depends upon the operation of two contrary spirits whom God has placed in the world, the spirit of light and the spirit of darkness. The element of dualism which enters the picture at this point and which has already been discussed above concerns us in the present context only insofar as it introduces a re-

¹ Jub. 37:20.

strictive feature into the social relationships between men. The Sectaries were taught to hate all who despised God's laws and perverted the true understanding of his statutes. Such men lived without hope of redemption, for they had condemned themselves already. Rather than jeopardize their chance for redemption by associating with people in a corrupt society, the Sectaries were commanded to separate themselves by a barrier of hatred and to treat the others as God's outcasts. Comparison with these men of lawlessness gave the Sectaries a sense of pride and achievement in attaining moral perfection. When they compared their righteousness with God's, however, they felt their own moral weakness and inadequacy. Recollection of guilty deeds and of faithlessness compelled a Qumran psalmist to confess:

"For my transgression
I am left outside thy covenant."
But I remembered the strength of thy hand
together with the abundance of thy mercy.
I rose and stood up, and my spirit became strong,
standing firm before affliction;
for I leaned on thy steadfast love
and thy abundant mercy.²

Confession of moral and spiritual weakness was followed by hope and joyous assurance, for God recognized and rewarded the one who thirsted after righteousness. The rewards were deliverance from Belial's unholy abyss and admission to the eternal plain of God's realm of light. In short, ethical failures need be no hindrance to an eternal reward for members of the Sect, who were the only ones who could attain eternal rewards.

The impact of Qumran moral insights upon Judaism can probably be found in John the Baptist's exhortations. Like the Sectaries', his eschatological views intensified his sensitivity to Israel's ethical responsibilities. He communicated the seriousness of the contemporary situation by warning his audiences that God was already beginning to cut down his own planting. Exhortations followed such dire proclamations. To bridge the gap between God's majestic

² DST 8.

righteousness and man's unworthiness, John urged men to repent, to prepare themselves for the judgment day, and to produce fruits worthy of repentance. For John, as for the prophets and the Sectaries, the attitude of repentance involved a reorientation of man's will, an attitude of contrition for sins committed, a confession of guilt, and a declaration of an intention to live acceptably in God's sight by the obedient performance of acts dictated by the demands of his holy will. To show the sincerity of their repentance, John urged men to express it publicly in a rite of baptism, which would in some way prepare them for the baptism by fire and the holy Spirit on the day of judgment.

Moreover, John the Baptist and the Sectaries agreed in emphasizing the importance of Abraham as the great hero of piety and good works. John's view of Abraham's significance is implied in his denunciation of his own generation, which relied upon its Abrahamic descent and upon Abraham's surplus of good deeds rather than upon its own moral and spiritual efforts to achieve salvation. Abraham, he believed, deserved a better progeny. According to the Sectaries, Abraham's righteousness exceeded the demands of the Law. He was more patient than the Law demanded and he practised circumcision before God made this rite a legal requirement at Mount Sinai. Abraham had also anticipated the Law by keeping the most important festivals in their appropriate seasons.

Finally, although John did not explicitly associate this type of piety with Abraham, in his exhortations he demanded a "more" of those who would choose the way of righteousness. The "more" involved at least prayer, fasting, the rite of baptism, and repentance. John's mission, which Christian tradition described as being according to the way of righteousness (Matt. 21:32), was to plead with and to threaten the nation by asserting that negligence in the performance of these deeds of exemplary piety would inevitably bring about its total destruction. Clearly, then, John agreed with the Sectaries in intensifying the demand for moral decision by recourse to the promises and threats of the judgment day. But it is also apparent that his way of righteousness did not end in Qumran monasticism. Although he had withdrawn from society to live in the wilderness, he felt compelled to address his message to the na-

tion as a whole rather than to the limited circle of an elect and righteous remnant.

When one turns to the few specific examples of John's moral directives which have been preserved in the documents of the New Testament, it is clear that he formulated his exhortations in accordance with traditional ethical standards (Luke 3:10-14). He told the crowds to share the surplus of their possessions with those less fortunate, and the publicans to collect only those taxes appointed to them. Soldiers should not use their weapons to threaten or to intimidate others to their own advantage. What John said, in effect, was that man must follow the traditional pattern of righteousness developed by a law-abiding Judaism under the influence of ethical monotheism. His eschatological proclamation did not give him a radically new perspective upon man's moral problem. He did not require men to distinguish between suitable and unsuitable vocations, or to change radically the basic conditions of their lives. Although his whole manner of life stood as a protest against the corruption of the priests operating in the urban center of Jerusalem and although he made demands for an active expression of repentance in acts of higher righteousness, his whole outlook, even more than that of the Sectaries, belonged to the traditional order and not to a new order.

Passing from John the Baptist to the early Church, we find not one but two different formulations of the nature of man's moral response to God's offer of salvation developing side by side. One is that of the Palestinian church, the other that of the church in the wider environment of the Roman world. Of the two the latter is the more well known, familiar to us especially from the letters of Paul and from the Fourth Gospel. The former, which had only a limited duration due to the effects of the Jewish Revolt of 66-71 A.D. and of the reconsolidation of Judaism, is less well attested but can be reconstructed in outline from three sources. The first source is the description of community life at Jerusalem in the post-resurrection period as given in the early chapters of Acts. The second is what we learn about the struggle between Paul and his Christian opponents from his letters. The third is to be found in the peculiar cast and interpretation given to the gospel of Jesus Christ by the

evangelist Matthew. Our purpose here is to set forth these two different formulations and to ask the question how they are related to the teaching of Jesus himself.

What Acts has to say about the Jerusalem community of Christians has already been considered from various angles and need detain us only briefly. The community was apparently quite self-contained at the outset. Underlying this may well have been the thought that the mission to the lost sheep of the house of Israel had been completed by Jesus during his lifetime and that, having been constituted and vindicated as the true congregation of Israel, what was required was to maintain that status and character while awaiting Jesus' return on the clouds. Precisely how to do this, particularly in an urban environment in which they were not precisely at home, may have been something of a problem. Those who, according to Acts, "were added" to the number of the believers may have helped determine policy and practice in these matters. The sharing of goods and the institution of fasting, to which reference has already been made suggests the development of an orderly administration of group life along lines familiar from Qumran. So does the breaking of the bread from house to house and the partaking of food with glad and generous hearts (Acts 2:46). Over and above this, there are only two details that deserve mention here. The first is the daily attendance of the group at the Temple for worship and prayer (Acts 2:46) and the second, the oneness of "heart and soul" that is said to have characterized their communal life (Acts 4:32). Clearly moral responsibility as visualized by this early group of believers is formulated in traditional terms. The new elements were largely outside the realm of the ethical and moral, belonging to the category of "mighty works," and it is precisely on this score that the difficulties between the community and the Jerusalem authorities are said to have developed (Acts 4:7).

What we learn about his Christian opponents from the letters of Paul helps to clarify the picture of this self-contained traditionalistic Christian community. His opponents denied the legitimacy of his apostleship (I Cor. 9:2), presumably maintaining that he had not accompanied Jesus during his lifetime and thus endeavoring to restrict the core element of the community. They observed times and

seasons (Gal. 4:10), upholding the traditional festival calendar. They kept the dietary requirements of the Law (Gal. 2:12) and demanded continuance of the ritual of circumcision (Gal. 6:12). By the time these things became issues between Paul and the Jerusalem church there was already a difference of opinion on some of the matters involved, and Paul takes occasion to say that the "pillars" were willing to adopt a realistic view of the success of his work and of his understanding of the moral responsibilities. But a "circumcision party" does seem to have held the upper hand at Jerusalem (Gal. 2:12) and it continued to be typical of the Jerusalem attitude and to cause Paul trouble. Here, then, the full measure of Christian conservatism in matters of ritual requirement comes to full expression. On the ritual side the moral requirements for participation in the divine redemption vary not an iota from the inherited Jewish tradition.

So far as the ethical side is concerned, the picture that we have of this Palestinian church can be amplified with the help of the Gospel of Matthew. As a responsible leader of Christian thought, this evangelist, so it would seem, was sincerely troubled by the antinomistic attitudes prevalent in the post-Pauline churches. Freedom in Christ tended to be understood as an irresponsible freedom. To check this development, the First Evangelist sought to prove by his gospel that Jesus had not abandoned the Law. In fact, Jesus' new law of higher righteousness surpassed the demands of the Mosaic Law. Furthermore, since he had subordinated the external observance of the Law to the inner content by spiritualizing the ordinances of Moses, Jesus came not to abolish the Law but to bring out of it the weightier and more important aspects of God's will for men. Fearing that the established Christian community was no longer faithful and diligent in good works and not ready for the Lord's return, this evangelist issued a call for righteousness which must be heeded by every disciple. Duty given an eschatological dimension intensified nomistic piety for this Christian author as it had for the Sectaries before him. Hence Jesus was portrayed not only as the teacher of a higher righteousness but also as the final judge of the obedient and disobedient.

From the evangelist's portrayal of Jesus, it is clear how completely

the author intended the Christian way of life to be a way of righteousness based upon Jesus' new code of laws. Jesus fulfilled his mission on earth not so much as the messianic leader empowered to perform mighty works but as the offspring of David's line who by his teaching showed that in him and in his ministry the Law of the Old Testament had been fulfilled and superseded. John the Baptist had come to prepare men for the acceptance of Jesus as the new law-giver by converting the repentant to the way of righteousness (Matt. 21:32). And, according to the Matthean version of Jesus' baptismal experience, Jesus permitted himself to be baptized in order to exhibit by his own life the full measure of righteousness which he also demanded of others (Matt. 3:13-17). Though he did not need to be baptized by someone who was of lesser rank than he, nonetheless the disciples' need for the rite compelled him to waive the question of the propriety of the greater being baptized by the lesser. Jesus' ultimate command to the disciples, therefore, was that they continue the baptismal rite in the name of the Father, the Son, and the holy Spirit and combine with it the teaching of his commandments of a higher righteousness (Matt. 28:19-20; cf. Matt. 5:17-48). The evangelist has attributed to Jesus the role of a teacher of higher righteousness which was similar to but, at the same time, infinitely superior to that of Moses, the giver of the old Law.

The evangelist proved the validity of his thesis by contrasting, in his collection of Jesus' teaching in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus' laws with those of Moses and by pointing out the superiority of Jesus' five discourses as the new Christian Pentateuch. The first of Jesus' discourses concerns the superiority of Christian righteousness to that of the scribes and Pharisees who follow Moses (Matt. 5-7); the next discourse takes up a second theme, that the disciples should be worthy of taking up their crosses to follow Jesus (Matt. 10); the third, that only followers of Jesus may inherit the Kingdom (Matt. 13); the fourth, that members of the Church must act ethically toward one another (Matt. 18); and the final theme, that Jesus' imminent return as the Son of Man should compel all Christians to remain morally upright (Matt. 24-25). Here, then, Jesus serves

as the giver of a new code of laws which were to be kept by all members of the Church.

Seen in its larger outlines, the picture of observantistic Jewish Christianity that develops from these strands of evidence is interesting for present purposes. It shows how deeply the inherited tradition was rooted in the minds and lives of the Jews of Palestine and how much stronger were the ties that bound Pharisees, Sectaries, Baptists, and Christians together than what separated them from each other. It is clear under these circumstances why the disaster that overtook the Jewish nation in the revolt of 66-71 A.D. had the same effect on observantistic Christianity that it did on all the other separate groups. The Gospel of Matthew, belonging to the period after this catastrophe, is a survival in modified form of a point of view that had already passed into history. Here it is important to note that in Matthew, as at Qumran, the effort to develop and guide the understanding of man's moral obligations is learnedly and systematically pursued. It would be easy to imagine Matthew having engaged in just such study sessions as were held at Qumran, with this difference that the words of Jesus provided the subject for study over and above what was in the biblical tradition.

In the larger environment of the Roman world, the Church was destined to develop a second and different interpretation of the procedure by which discharge was made of the obligations that man owed to God in connection with his hope for redemption. The development was already in progress before Paul's day, but he was the one who gave it its classic formulation. Paul's training as a Jew was along highly traditional lines. As a Pharisee he was taught to have a high regard for the sanctity of the Law. It was the gift of a righteous God and was, therefore, sacred and authoritative. By observing all the laws, one could achieve a righteousness that would make one acceptable to God and make it possible for him to be justified by God. But it was at this point that Paul ran into his major difficulty. He found that, no matter how hard he tried, he could not keep the whole Law (Gal. 5:3, Rom. 7:5, 9, 18-24). Indeed, according to his interpretation of Scripture, no one could achieve perfection, and, therefore, no one could be righteous and have the full satisfaction of doing the whole will of God (Rom.

3:10). For Paul, this impasse meant that the whole scheme of redemption on the basis of personal righteousness was bankrupt and that under it no one could gain salvation.

For a man of Paul's spiritual sensitivity, the problem at issue was not academic; it was a matter of life and death and the eternal salvation of his own soul and of all mankind was at stake. The problem was resolved for Paul in connection with his conversion to Christianity. How the resolution was effected is, of course, unknown, but the crucial factor seems to have been the understanding of Christ's death and resurrection. Having been confronted with the risen Christ, he could no longer regard Jesus' death as the just punishment of a blasphemer; he was forced to think of it in positive terms as an essential factor in a divine plan. That plan he understood as redemptive in character and the part played by Jesus' death as the sacrifice by which atonement was made for the sins of men.

The miraculous, divine character of the event meant for Paul that God cared so much for men's salvation that he was willing to demonstrate the costly depth of his love for those who in no way deserved it. Christ did not die to save the righteous but to save those who were helpless, ungodly sinners (Rom. 5:6-8). As a consequence of this conviction, Paul felt as though he had entered into an order of light, hope, and certain victory for his soul (II Cor. 4:6, I Cor. 15:8, Phil. 3:12, Gal. 1:16, 1:20). The experience necessitated a complete rethinking of the traditional approach to the question of salvation. Paul still used traditional Jewish terminology in speaking of men's salvation. Men still found justification before God in terms of the achievement of righteousness. Prior to his conversion, the idea of justification had signified the achievement of righteousness by doing good works and, so stated, included the correct performance of both the ritual and ethical statutes of the Mosaic Law. His conversion to Christianity, however, revolutionized his entire outlook, for now he realized that justification could not be achieved by doing the works of the Law; it was achieved by grace through faith; that is, an attitude of receptivity toward the prevenient grace of God. Thus he shifted the emphasis away from the Law and came closer to Jesus' own teaching, for Jesus himself had made the abandoned response to the manifestation of God's saving will the

basis of hope for men.³ Evidence of God's will to deliver men was seen by Jesus in many events. Paul, however, had come to believe that Jesus' death and resurrection was the one event which manifested God's grace and, consequently, that the crucified and risen Christ had replaced the Law as a norm for ethical thought and action.

This concept so completely changed Paul's approach to the ethical problem that it brought him to a point of view which in its essential formulation contrasted sharply with those of contemporary Judaism and of the Palestinian church. While he would have agreed with the Sectaries that through the indwelling of the holy Spirit, through the mercy of God, and through faith in the founder of the religious movement to which one belonged, one would be cleansed of the impurity of sin, he would have stated the propositions differently in each instance. For Paul these differences were crucial. Thus, according to the Sectaries, justification was granted men through faith *and* works so that obedience to the commandments of the Law became a prerequisite for the receiving of God's grace. But, for Paul, man was justified on faith alone, and obedience to God's will was the result of the previous reception of God's mercy.

Compared with the Sectaries' or the Jerusalem church's demands for a strict and undeviating obedience to God's laws, Paul's freedom of ethical decision and action may have seemed to lead to license and moral irresponsibility. Paul, however, explained his position by stating that man, having found a new freedom of action in Christ, belonged to Christ and, consequently, that Christian liberty intensified the serious sense of responsibility. Christian freedom did not lead one to self-gratification or to self-indulgence but to "faith working through love" for the good of the neighbor (Gal. 5:6). The Old Testament laws, Paul argued, lacked the power to inspire men to an ethical conduct which God granted to men whose wills were

³ Jesus' negative attitude regarding salvation earned through good works is expressed clearly in his parable about the unworthy servant who, having done all that was commanded, had done only his duty (Luke 17:7-10). His primary concern is that men trust the Father to give them the Kingdom as an act of the same "good pleasure" that leads him to feed the ravens and to clothe the grass of the field (Luke 12:22-32).

guided by the Spirit of Christ. The spiritual man who had been captivated by Christ's Spirit had crucified the flesh with its passions and desires and no longer did the works of the flesh but the works of the Spirit. Such works were concrete deeds exhibiting attitudes of love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control against which there was no law (Gal. 5:18-23). Freedom from the Law, therefore, did not imply a lack of self-discipline and a flight from the world with its problems of moral responsibility, but it meant fulfilling the law of love freely and spontaneously as commanded by Christ, and not as a slave to the Law of Moses.

Significantly, the conviction that new moral energies were derived from sharing in Christ's crucifixion and resurrection did not lead Paul to conclude that a Christian's moral struggle had come to an end. Paul was well aware of the kind of lives which his converts still led. Though he addressed his converts as saints who were consecrated to Christ, he also realized that they had not yet arrived at a full comprehension of what this new life meant in terms of their responsibilities. Hence in his letters Paul included hortatory sections to explain the meaning of Christian liberty. When possible he praised the members of his churches for their initial attempts to live according to the new life of the Spirit. But he also reminded them of their need for further growth and maturity. For example, he addressed the Christians of the Corinthian church as saints but at the same time called them "babes" who had, as yet, an infantile understanding of the basic tenets of Christian morality. In Paul's opinion, their pride in spiritual powers, such as ecstatic utterance and prophecy, and their complacent attitude toward flagrantly immoral practices, were evidence of an immature conscience. Consequently Paul felt compelled to write them about another spiritual gift which they should strive to possess. There was a better way to show the fruits of one's life in Christ than to seek after prophecy and incoherent babblings of a spirit-enthusiasm. The way was love.

Paul's description of the excellence of love is one of the most profound and significant passages in the New Testament. He begins his description with a statement regarding the superiority of love over other spiritual gifts (I Cor. 13:1-3). Prophecy and speaking

with tongues are useless because they serve merely as vindications of one's self-importance and not as a means of placing one's self in a constructive relationship to someone else. Similarly, without love even the extreme act of self-negation through immolation has no religious significance, because the act does not show the preferment of another's good to one's own (I Cor. 13:4-7). Paul continues his description by illustrating its constructive character in social relationships. Love overthrows humanly constructed barriers such as resentment, tactlessness, bragging over others' ethical weaknesses, and the inflation of one's own self-importance. These attitudes separate a man from his neighbor and restrain an outgoing love toward the neighbor. Furthermore, love has a permanence not found in other spiritual gifts. Prophecy and speaking with tongues have only a temporary significance and even knowledge is a part of a transient imperfect order. What is of lasting value is a triad of concepts that belong together: faith, hope, and love. They all have one thing in common—they are elements of an outreach for things which men hope to attain. Love, however, is the greatest of the three because it will endure. When the eschatological consummation comes, the elements of faith and of hope will be seen and realized. The one thing that cannot disappear in the transition from the present to the future is the eternal fact of love: God's outreach to men and men's to God and to their fellowmen. Since faith will disappear with vision and hope with fulfilment, love alone is eternal and will continue beyond this present age (I Cor. 13:8-13).

The importance of this chapter for Christian ethics cannot be overemphasized, for it is a brilliant reaffirmation of Jesus' teaching. While at many points Paul introduced new patterns of thought into the Church's understanding of life, at the heart of the Christian religion however, he retained a concept of God as mercifully loving the sinner in an endeavor to reconcile the sinner to Himself. This concept became the basis of Paul's ethical teaching, that a Christian must endeavor to show what God's love through Christ means for him in terms of love for the neighbor. The Church was not to indulge itself in the emotionalism of a pentecostal sect. But guided by the Spirit of Christ who gave himself freely and to the utmost for men's salvation, Christ's followers must also be morally sensitive

to men's needs and give themselves freely for the good of the neighbor.

In earlier contexts, mention has been made of the special importance attaching to the Fourth Gospel as a witness to the christological thought of the Church outside the Palestinian scene, and to the restrictions which the gospel places upon the number of those who may properly be regarded as the heirs of the promise of redemption. It is unnecessary to belabor these points further in the present context, but one feature of the concept of man's responsibility as the Fourth Evangelist understood it calls for additional comment here. In Paul, as we have seen, man's acceptability before God is the result of the act of faith and the perfection of man's ethical life the work of the Spirit. Both of these ideas are inherited and transmitted by the Fourth Evangelist, but both take on a new guise and have a new quality imparted to them. What gives them their new quality is the nature of the divine revelation and of its appropriation. For the Fourth Evangelist the Christ who is the object of faith is that pre-existent person in the Godhead to whom the designation "Word" is appropriate and who manifests God in all his operating procedures. To believe in Christ is to know him for what he is and to confess him in terms of this knowledge. A reflective, intellectual factor thus enters into the substance of faith. Believing and knowing are closely paired. "This is life eternal," Jesus says about his disciples in prayer to God, "that they shall know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent" (Jn. 17:3). Not only that; the function of the holy Spirit, when it comes, will be to guide men into all truth (Jn. 16:13). This cognitive aspect of man's response to the offer of redemption brings the Fourth Gospel closer to the Sectaries than any other New Testament document. At the same time it makes the final adjustment of the Christian message to its larger Roman environment and sets the stage for the development both of Gnosticism and of Christian orthodoxy.

Having followed to their ultimate conclusions the two different interpretations of the moral response to the divine offer of redemption that the Church of the New Testament period gave, it remains only to ask how the two may be related to the teaching of Jesus himself.

Fundamentally Jesus' approach to the problem of men's moral responsibility was Jewish and reflects dependence upon the tradition of the Old Testament. First, it is clear that neither Jesus nor the Jews regarded ethical ideas as validated by their own intrinsic merit. They did not urge doing the good and achieving virtue for the sake of their own rewards. One performed the good deed because the will of God demanded an ethical response from men corresponding to his action toward them. Jesus, as well as his fellow Jews, referred to the writings of the Old Testament as a record in which God had revealed to Moses and the prophets the nature and intention of his will for men. Second, it is also clear that, when Jesus and his Jewish contemporaries spoke of being perfect, they did not have in mind an absolute perfection that might serve to make the individual acceptable to God. Men having done all they could were still dependent upon God's mercy. Third, it is also clear that neither Jesus nor the Jews generally regarded the goal of ethical teachings to be the creation of a better world. Men were called to obey God's will and not to a program of correcting the evils of society or of promoting the welfare of human beings. If as a result of obedience to God's will, a better social order and a greater self-realization for each individual were gained, it came as a by-product of, or as an extension of, human obedience to God. Fourth, Jesus agreed with some of his contemporaries, notably the Sectaries, that consideration of man's moral responsibility must include motives and intentions of ethical action as well as the deed itself. Finally, Jesus, the Sectaries, and John the Baptist agreed that the imminence of the coming crisis, that is, the final day of judgment, required that men now give serious thought to the moral character of their lives.

While Jesus and his Jewish contemporaries agreed on these fundamentals, they had different opinions about certain moral issues of the day. The Sectaries and Jesus differed on what to do about the corruption of the political and religious leaders. The disillusioned Sectaries separated themselves from the disobedient of the nation to found a house of the Law in the wilderness. Jesus, however, did not make an issue of national corruption but attempted to alleviate the distress of those who had been labeled outcasts. This brought him into conflict with the Pharisees, who in their search for a per-

fection of piety had become supernomists. Such groups, in his opinion, were so observantistic in their misinterpretation of the function of the Law that they allowed the unfortunate to be cast out and left without hope of redemption. The use of the Law as a means of narrowing down the community of God's people to a limited and chosen few was in his judgment a misrepresentation of God's purpose in giving the Law. He had intended it to be more inclusive in its scope and to quicken the hearts of all of Israel to respond obediently to him.

Although Jesus and his nomistic opponents both claimed to interpret the Mosaic Law correctly and thus to uphold it, their positions were irreconcilable. This is evident from the disputes about the Sabbath, fasting, and ritual worship, in which Jesus' opponents accused him and his followers of undermining and destroying the Law. The observantists also criticized Jesus and his disciples because they did not keep themselves separate from people known to be non-observers of the Law. The concepts underlying their objections were that the Law must be the supreme factor in the life of the Jewish people and that its continuation as a significant factor necessitated a regard for the Law as an organic and living growth rather than as a changeless code. The concept of the importance of the Law dictated that the Jews' chief purpose in life was to observe the Law in its entirety; the second concept dictated that the laws must be made to apply to contemporary conditions by recourse to expert interpretation. As laudable as both purposes in the observantistic approach might be, Jesus' fundamental objection was that they led to a misunderstanding of the essential purpose of the Law and placed its fulfilment beyond the competence of most of the nation.

According to the gospel narrative and the stories of the controversies which the evangelists have reported, Jesus opposed the casuistic approach of the observantists for a variety of reasons. The observantists, he felt, had lost sight of the place of man in God's created world. Proof of their distortion of the Law was their interpretation of the Sabbath ordinance, which permitted them to help an ox or an ass that had fallen into a pit on the Sabbath day but not one of the daughters of Abraham. Jesus' objection to the Sabbath observ-

ance of the rabbis implies an even greater criticism of the stricter Sabbath laws of the Qumran Sect. Without understanding the circumstances of an individual's inability to perform the demands of the Law, the observantists frequently assumed that they had sufficient and reliable evidence to classify such an individual as a sinner without hope of redemption. Nor was the observantist inclined to regard the sinner's attitude of repentance for past sins and his attitude of faith and trust in God as an adequate indication that he now wanted to live as a child of God and that God could in turn regard such an individual as one worthy of salvation. Furthermore, the hypocritical attitude of the strict observantists who followed the letter of ritual laws without a genuine feeling of devotion for God was intolerable to Jesus. Some observantists were, in fact, so inflexible that they endeavored to follow a law when unusual circumstances made a sincere response to the law impossible. This type of obedience tended to encourage a false sense of pride in one's discipline in the Law and of one's spiritual achievements. The attitude expressed by Jesus in these matters makes understandable, therefore, the extreme position of the Hellenistic Christians who had entered the Church with Greek ideas of freedom of moral decision and action and who welcomed the idea of Jesus' supersedence over the Mosaic Law.

The synoptic evangelists, on the other hand, also portrayed Jesus as one who had a genuine respect for the Law and believed that, through the Law, God had revealed his will. One report of a controversy between Jesus and his opponents bears significantly on this issue (Mk. 10:1-9). The Pharisees opened the controversy by asking Jesus whether it was lawful for a man to divorce his wife. As the dispute developed, Jesus asked his opponents a counterquestion: "What is the teaching of Scripture on divorce?" In reply the Pharisees quoted from the Mosaic Law that divorce was permitted and that a man by giving his wife notice of termination of the marriage contract could be freed from responsibilities toward her. Jesus referred them back to the story of creation where Moses wrote that God had created man male and female and that a man, therefore, must leave his father and mother to be one with his wife. What God has joined, man must not separate.

The controversy bears on the larger issue of observantism because it indicates that Jesus was willing to recognize an element of contradiction in the Mosaic Law—that in Deuteronomy Moses had made a concession regarding the marriage relationship because of man's hardness of heart and that in the narrative of creation no concession was implied. It also indicates that Jesus was willing to recognize the possibility that some of Moses' laws could be regarded as imperfect vehicles for the expression of God's will and, therefore, not normative for men's actions. It points out further that, in attempting to resolve this contradiction in the Mosaic revelation, Jesus sought as normative that which expressed an understanding of God in constructive and not in concessive terms and that he made the rigorous and radical expression of God's will for men the basis of his ethical teaching. Jesus, therefore, answered his opponents by saying, in effect, that before one can answer a specific question regarding man's moral obligations on the basis of a single statute one must first search the books of Moses to ascertain God's true intention for men. The particular problem of divorce should not be answered in the light of men's, even of Moses', attempt to ameliorate the difficulties of the responsibilities of marriage but should be answered in the light of God's will in his establishment of marriage. Marriage, therefore, was to be seen as a basic and permanent relationship and as an institution given sanctity by God at the very beginning of things when he created the world and established certain fundamental relationships between people. In this controversy on divorce, therefore, one finds at one and the same time Jesus' reverence for the Mosaic Law and his willingness to say, "You have heard it said of old . . . but I say to you."

In yet another respect Jesus would have aroused the opposition of the Qumran observantists, though not necessarily that of the rabbis. From the Sectaries' point of view, it was their duty to obey *all* the laws as given by Moses and the prophets and as interpreted by them through new revelations. The attempt of certain rabbis of Jesus' day and of Jesus to answer the question, "What is the greatest commandment?" would imply that lesser value was to be found in the other statutes of the Old Testament. Consequently one does not find in the documents of the Sectaries, as in the record of Jesus'

ministry, a radical summation of the Law in two commandments. To say that the whole Law could be compressed into two commandments—thou shalt love God with all thy heart, mind, soul, and strength, and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself—indicated that an individual was capable of evaluating the various laws and of applying a selective factor in determining the greater importance of certain laws. Furthermore, Jesus' method of interpreting the Old Testament laws by means of parables indicated a desire to break away from the observantistic tradition. It shows his inclination to define the laws not casuistically, but illustratively. Hence when the lawyer asked him the question—"Who is my neighbor?"—Jesus did not give him a brief for his instruction but told the story of the Good Samaritan. Interestingly, this parable illustrates a change in Jesus' understanding of who the neighbor is, for he did not limit the term, as had the priestly observantists (cf. Lev. 19), to one's fellow Jew or to the proselyte who had adopted the Jewish way of life. The story illustrates both Jesus' method in dealing with the Mosaic Law and the new ethical insights expressed by his interpretation of the Law. The Law was not to be interpreted by further laws but by parables intended not as new laws but as illustrations of attitudes. The attitude became the directive by which each individual decided for himself what course of action he should take in specific cases as they arose.

By reducing the laws to two basic demands and by defining these laws illustratively and not casuistically, Jesus indicated that he was not sympathetic to the observantistic approach to the Law which the Sectaries and other Jews had adopted. His attempt to broaden and make the Law more inclusive, so that all men might find God's will revealed in the Law, would have offended the Sectaries, who believed that it was possible for only a limited number of people to dedicate themselves sufficiently to the task of understanding and obeying all the laws.

Apparently Jesus did not conceive of the function of the Law as a body of regulative material that must be made relevant by oral interpretation. Rather he regarded it as a possible instrument, imperfect as it might be upon occasions, for revealing God's will for

men's lives. Starting with the revelation given in the Old Testament, Jesus did not hesitate to go beyond the Law in giving new ethical directives based on new insight given to him by God. At times his teaching and actions indicated that he thought the Law might even be more than imperfect, for it could also mislead people into believing that by obeying its commandments they had arrived at a falsely conceived perfection of ethical piety. Jesus could regard such individuals as the rich young man and the elder brother mentioned in the parable of the prodigal son as observantists without depth in their understanding of God's will and nature. The rich young man had obeyed all the ethical commands of the decalogue from his youth, but still loved and relied upon his wealth rather than upon God. Since the Law had blunted his sensitivity to the moral and spiritual situation, Jesus suggested that he give his wealth to the poor, take up his cross, and follow him in order that this radical change in his manner of life might give him an understanding of what it meant to love God wholly and to love one's neighbor as one's self. In the case of the elder brother, Jesus contrasted his complaining piety with the attitude of the prodigal's repentant humility. In certain situations the Law, therefore, might not serve even as a means for understanding God's will, for men might fail to use it as a vehicle for realizing the full scope of their obligations to God and to their fellowmen.

According to the record of Jesus' teaching on the Law, it is not surprising that the early Church took two opposing positions regarding the value of the Law. The Palestinian church could find ample justification for their continuation of the Mosaic tradition in Jesus' veneration of the Old Testament. He had quoted it frequently in arguing with his opponents and for the formulation of his own thinking. In finding it necessary, however, to develop an observantism similar in some respects to that of the Sectaries, this branch of the Church brought some of Jesus' followers back to an outlook against which Jesus had contended. On the other hand, the Hellenistic community, wanting to be freed from the observantistic tradition of Israel, believed that Jesus by his new teaching with authoritative power had undercut the Law. They saw the

spontaneity of his response to particular situations and turned to the life of the spirit as the new positive basis for moral action. Their conviction that Jesus had put an end to the Law and consequently that the Law had no value was also, in a sense, a misrepresentation of Jesus' appraisal of the Law. The origin of the two developments within the Church, the one which championed the observantistic solution to man's ethical problems and the other which was violently opposed to that position, therefore, lies in Jesus' teaching regarding the Law.

This discussion of Jesus' attitude toward the Law and of the two developments springing from it raises the question whether Jesus himself was the author of a new moral code for his followers. It is clear that, when Jesus answered the question, "Who is my neighbor?" by a parable, he was not dealing with the issue in a nomistic fashion but was endeavoring to illustrate rather than to define the concept of the neighbor. The intention and function of Jesus' ethical teaching, which he presented at times in nomistic forms, however, are not so clear. Such hortatory sayings as, "If any one strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also," "Whoever divorces his wife and marries another, commits adultery against her," and "Do not swear at all" are not easily understood as they are preserved in the gospels and in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount in particular.

To deal with the problem fully would require an extended discussion of each saying in the light of contemporary customs. The statement regarding the cheek, for example, apparently concerned a man who had been doubly insulted by a backhanded slap. In this situation Jesus suggested that the problem of one's relationship to an insulter could not be improved by trading insult for insult but by exhibiting an attitude of excessive good will toward the neighbor. Thereby one not only ignored the insult but attempted to prevent the erection of barriers of hostility between men. This attitude toward the neighbor was one which an individual endeavored to create in circumstances unfavorable to its expression. The saying, so interpreted, is to be understood, not nomistically, but as a moral directive which deals with man's intentions more than with the outward performance of an ethical law. Since the saying is thus

illustrative of an attitude, it serves the same purpose as a parable. Similarly, Jesus' teaching on marriage had as its primary purpose, not the prevention of divorce, but the clarification of marriage as the means of accomplishing the divine will. Likewise, if the purpose of Jesus' teaching on oaths was to outlaw the use of the oath, then this saying is a moral commandment and might form a part of Jesus' new code. But, if it was to enunciate the idea that no amount of oath-taking would solve the problem of dishonesty among men who lacked the fundamentals of integrity, then the statement is a directive for moral action and not a law.

In the light of Jesus' typical approach to men's ethical situation, it would seem that the prohibitory form of many of his sayings is an accommodation to an environment which was familiar with nomistic formulations. The purpose of such sayings was to declare that the basis of the oath was rooted in a suspicion of evil and that the basis of divorce was rooted in the frail character of men who sought to solve the problem of marital obligations by escaping from them. Furthermore, the sayings also had a positive purpose; they meant to say that only by integrity can man hope to transcend the dilemma which an oath seeks to solve, but does not, and that only by grasping the idea of the sanctity given by God to the marriage relationship can one transcend the stress which divorce seeks to alleviate, but does not.

It appears, therefore, that Jesus did not intend to set up a new code of moral laws but that he gave men moral directives indicating what men's basic attitudes toward each other should be. Hence his ethical teaching was simpler, more exacting, and of greater value for the individual than a code would have been. It was simpler, because he described the attitudes of moral responsibility to the neighbor in the simple terms of need. It was more exacting, because each individual must take upon himself the burden of making his own decision in moral issues. It was of greater value, because the individual, given this freedom of decision, could apply the fundamental attitudes taught by Jesus to the changing circumstances created by new environments and by new eras. Since Jesus had a negative attitude toward the observantistic approach to men's ethical

problems, it does not seem likely that he meant to establish a new code of ethical laws. The codification of his ethical teachings by the author of the First Gospel in particular was, therefore, a departure from Jesus' outlook and was the result of the Church's need to formulate norms for ethical decision and action. The continuation of the ethical life of the Spirit in the Hellenistic community, however, brought to expression the freedom of moral decision which Jesus himself had encouraged.

It has been argued above that the Church found in Jesus' teaching the origin of the non-observantistic approach to man's ethical dilemma. Fundamentally, the approach was far from novel, for Jesus followed the Old Testament prophets, who believed that the obligation of man's response to the divine will took precedence over the forms used for its expression. The compulsive factor directing man's response lay immediately in the causative will of God and not in the codification of his commands as formulated by the observantists. While the tension between the two approaches existed in the Hebraic tradition, it did not have the character of a bitter and irreconcilable conflict. By the first century A.D., when reliance upon the traditional authority of Mosaic Law was regarded by religious leaders as the orthodox approach, the controversy created by a revival of the prophetic understanding of man's ethical problem was inevitable. In the gospels the controversy takes place between Jesus and the Pharisaic observantists. Had his opponents been the Sectaries, it would have been equally bitter.

The controversy between prophets and religious authorities, whether it involved the prophets from Amos to Jeremiah or John the Baptist and Jesus, typically concerned specific issues that became matters of debate because the prophets claimed to have new insights regarding them. The specific issue raised by Jesus, as Klausner has pointed out, is to be found in his statement that God "makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust" (Matt. 5:45b).⁴ In such affirmations as

⁴ Klausner maintains that Jesus conceived of God's love in such radical terms that he undermined the doctrine of God's absolute righteousness and of God's action in history (*Jesus of Nazareth*, translated from the Hebrew

this one, Jesus maintained that God was acting toward individuals, whether they deserved it or not, with an attitude of the highest good will and was promising his Kingdom to the unfortunate, the ostracized, and the rejected. In other words, God's actions were unconstrained, spontaneous, uncalculating, completely concerned with man's salvation and could not be defined or delimited by the boundaries of Old Testament Law with its rewards and punishments for the just and the unjust, the evil and the good. The consequences of such an understanding of God's nature and will for new ethical insights might be summed up as follows: as God spontaneously and creatively acts with good will toward man, so man as a child of God must also do spontaneously and responsibly that which is creatively good for his neighbor, the neighbor who is not only the friend but also the enemy. The directive here expressed would not have been sympathetic to that of the Qumran Sect.

Nor would Jesus' attempt to relate his eschatological views to his ethical outlook be acceptable to the Qumran Sect. Jesus' lack of interest in the apocalyptic form of eschatology (i.e., the scheduling of events leading to the judgment day and the descriptive features of the new age) and his rejection of the emotionally vindictive aspects of eschatological views were contrary to Qumran thought. Jesus' eschatological outlook served the purposes of his practical religious teaching which concerned repentance, faith, love for God and

by H. Danby [New York, 1943], pp. 279-80). Since Jesus' contemporaries conceived of God as one who kept love and righteousness in scrupulous balance Klausner is correct in his criticism of Jesus' teaching, for Jesus did declare that God's love outweighed his righteousness. In practice, though not in theory, it may be said that the righteousness and love of God tended to be seen by Jesus' contemporaries in terms of the particular pattern of God's action in choosing Israel. Without denying the relation between the love of God and the historical fact of Israel's election by God, Jesus apparently had occasion also to witness God's love for the non-Jew and was able to think of God as one who was seeking the lost, whether Jew or Gentile. Jesus, then, understood God's love as radical and unconditional. Klausner is correct in his judgment, therefore, only if one means by "God in history" that one is to see God at work exclusively in Jewish history and if one can have only one absolute in his conception of God.

the neighbor, and the performance of good deeds. Furthermore, he accented the relief and the joy which this terminal act of God would bring for the poor in spirit, the humble, and the unfortunate victims of evil forces. The unlimited depth of God's love would be apparent on the day of judgment and would reverse men's fortunes in ways quite unexpected by the observantists with their traditional ideas of those who belong in the categories of the just and the unjust, the evil and the good.

These emphases of Jesus' ethical teaching were continued by the Church even in the Palestinian community, although the churches of the Hellenistic world more clearly expressed them. Since it was through Christ that his followers had derived this new understanding of the ethical life of the spirit, they had come to associate it with him. If one had the mind of Christ, he related himself to the neighbor by serving him through love. Although Jesus had quoted the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," from the Mosaic Law, it had become his commandment. For the Church, its newness was not to be found in the recentness of its origin but in the interpretation given to it by Jesus' teaching and by his personal conduct. While it is true that Paul, among the leaders of the early Church, had grasped more profoundly than others the full impact of Jesus' ethical teaching, it is also true that none of the writers of the New Testament documents lost the significance of the new impulse given by Jesus to man's ethical life. Circumstantial factors may have compelled some Christian writers to codify Jesus' moral imperatives or to narrow down the scope of love for the neighbor to the members of the Church itself. But by their codification they did not mean to exalt correctness of external behavior over an attitude of responsible and creative love for the neighbor. Nor even by their deepening of love for members of their own group did they become a separatist group, discontinuing the missionary program of the Church. The new life of the spirit of love was to be shared by all men who understood through Christ Jesus, as never before, the meaning of the relatedness of their lives to God and to their neighbor.

Though living in the same general period of Israel's history and

though starting with the same basic premises, the Sectaries and the early Christian communities differed radically in their views about man's moral responsibility. The Sectaries first encountered the moral and spiritual crisis in Judaism and witnessed the disintegration of the nation's standards at the hand of its own political and religious leaders. Since these leaders were the direct descendants of those who had so valiantly fought against the Seleucid overlords for the Jewish Law and for religious liberty, the Sectaries' disappointment turned to acute despair. Persecution of their Teacher, who had attempted to revive the ancient traditions, drove them into seclusion. By establishing a community dedicated to the keeping of the Mosaic commandments, they sought to preserve past ideals and thus to secure their salvation. Their efforts brought the nomistic tradition to its most complete and final expression. No greater attempt to achieve such perfection in the Law could be made.

On the other hand, the followers of Jesus had received from him a new approach to the moral problems of the day. This new approach found its basis in a revolutionary understanding of God's actions toward men which canceled out the way of observantism and separatism for the early Christian communities. Consequently members of the Christian Church broadened the concept of the neighbor and found themselves involved in a program of missionary expansion. Since God's love for men was inclusive and not limited, the Church could not restrict a concern for the neighbor's good to the members of its group but must bring the message of good news to all mankind. Also, as a consequence of Jesus' teaching regarding the nature of man's response to God and to men, they could no longer formulate their ideas of ethical responsibility solely upon the nomistic tradition of Judaism but turned to the new ethical life of the Spirit. This approach brought them a greater freedom and creativity than the nomistic tradition allowed. Their response to the human situation became, therefore, not a religious movement dedicated to the preservation of old ideals but a movement which committed its followers to place their lives under the guidance of God's Spirit as seen in the person of Christ. It was this ethical life of the Spirit that gave the Church a new basis for ethics and the desire to

transform the human situation rather than to withdraw from it. Finally, the special relevance of this new insight, theological and ethical, for the question of redemption was the reversal of the observantist's pattern. Good works were not the precondition of salvation but the resultant activities of one who had experienced salvation through Christ. Here the motivation for ethical action sprang from the sense of being a new creature in Christ. Crucifixion with Christ killed the desire for gratification of the self and set one in the direction of the neighbor's good.

CHAPTER NINE

Acts of Devotion

Divine worship through acts of public and private devotion was an essential part of the religious tradition which the Qumran Sect and the Christian Church inherited from their common ancestor, the religious community of Israel. In the many centuries preceding the origin of the two groups, the Jewish nation had developed a great wealth of materials for use in worship and an elaborate set of agencies and occasions for their employment. Public worship was the special responsibility of a priestly class functioning in the one sacred Temple at Jerusalem. Here were observed daily and weekly rites and a cycle of movable festivals the dates of which were determined by observation of the movements of celestial bodies, and which together made up the annual festival calendar.¹ For use in all these services there were available in great quantity prayers, hymns, and liturgical materials.

Both the Qumran Sect and the early Church, since they regarded themselves as the true Israel, thought of this heritage of devotional materials and observance as belonging to them. They had appropriated the Scriptures of the Jewish people; one would hardly expect them to reject its devotional heritage. Starting from this com-

¹ J. van Goudoever in his very important study of biblical calendars calls attention to the difficulty of finding a satisfactory term for the sequence of religious events which constitute a religious calendar. By his use of the term "calendar," he means the "yearly seasonal cycle" determined by the "orbit of the sun with its daily and yearly seasonal cycles, by the phases of the moon, by a system of counting a weekly cycle of seven days, and sometimes by a system of counting the years in sabbatic periods" (*Biblical Calendars* [Leiden, 1959], p. vii).

mon ground, the two communities reacted in analogous fashion. They qualified their acceptance of the tradition, and they supplemented it in accordance with their individual needs. Both types of reactions have in them an element of radicalism and this radicalism even leads to common results, for instance in the way in which each group, for its own reasons and under its own special set of circumstances, turned aside from the Temple at Jerusalem. But the radicalism in these matters is sometimes more apparent than real in both camps. Devotions were too important as factors in ancient religious life to be taken lightly, and only the most compelling reasons would serve to justify departures or supplements. Care must therefore be taken in any comparison of the two communities not to underestimate the common debt to the common source or to dismiss differences lightly.

A general discussion of what is known about the ceremonial life and observance of the Qumran Sect requires consideration of a variety of subjects. These include the procedures used to determine the dates of the movable festivals, the meaning of the festivals themselves as they interpreted them, the attitude toward the Temple at Jerusalem and to the sacrificial cult, and the new rites which the Sect developed for its own needs. Basic to the whole, however, is the question of what the Sectaries thought about the priesthood that was the instrument through which all acts of devotion were performed. This was the very point upon which the separation of the Qumran Sect from the parent body had turned, back in the late second century B.C., the question being whether the priestly family which the Maccabean revolt had put in power was properly and legitimately discharging the sacred priestly function for the nation.

In the opinion of the Sectaries, the Maccabees had disqualified themselves for the high office of religious leaders in Israel by their actions; what was worse, they had usurped an office which God had appointed for Aaron and his descendants and, among the latter, for the descendants of Zadok in particular. The limitation, they believed, derived from the fact that Eli's sons, among the descendants of Aaron, had abused their priestly privileges. God had, therefore, condemned Eli's line and vowed that he would raise up a faithful priest who would fulfil all God's commandments. This prophecy,

the Sectaries claimed, had been fulfilled in Zadok, who during Solomon's reign remained alone as priest in Jerusalem after the banishment of Abiathar.² Hence the Sectaries had a double reason for condemning the Maccabean priests; they had not only polluted God's sanctuary, as had the sons of Eli, but had presumed to place themselves in an office which legally could belong only to another branch of the Aaronic line. The secularization of the official priesthood of Jerusalem eventually became intolerable to the descendants of Zadok, so they joined the Sect which henceforth espoused their cause.

One of the innovations introduced by the officials controlling ceremonial worship at Jerusalem in the second century B.C. was the revision of the religious calendar.³ The new calendar, in the opinion of the Sectaries, was completely wrong in the way it advanced or postponed the dates for the celebration of holy days. Within the memory of the Sectaries, an event had occurred which had united the immediate predecessors of the Sect, the *hasidim*, and the Maccabean family on this issue, for together they had fought against Antiochus Epiphanes in his attempt to change the Law and the

² For the details of this conflict, see Frank Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (New York, 1958), pp. 96-119.

³ The problem of the Qumran calendar has been discussed extensively. Two significant conclusions seem to emerge from this discussion: that the Sectaries maintained a traditional calendar in opposition to calendrical innovations instituted by religious authorities in power at Jerusalem and that the Sect was endeavoring to reconcile the lunar and solar cycles in its attempt to regulate traditional observances. For a discussion of the Qumran calendar and the material in Jubilees and Enoch related to this problem, see A. Jaubert, "Le calendrier de Jubilé et de la secte de Qumrân. Ses origines bibliques," *VT*, III (1953), 250-64; also J. Morgenstern, "The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees: Its Origin and Its Character," *VT*, V (1955), 34-76. Further discussions relevant to the problem are to be found in J. Obermann, "Calendaric Elements in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *IBL*, LXXV (1956), 285-97; J. B. Segal, "Intercalation and the Hebrew Calendar," *VT*, VII (1957), 250-307; E. R. Leach, "A Possible Method of Intercalation for the Calendar of the Book of Jubilees," *VT*, VII (1957), 392-97; John Bowman, "Is the Samaritan Calendar the Old Zadokite One?" *PEQ*, XCI (1957), 23-37; Frank Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, p. 36; and M. Burrows, *More Light* (New York, 1958), pp. 373-78.

"times"⁴ (Dan. 7:25). This Seleucid ruler had tried to crush Jewish particularism through the suppression of the Jewish Law and possibly by the substitution of the Hellenistic lunar calendar.⁵ When the Maccabee family gained its victory over the Seleucids and rose to power, it in turn capitulated to the customs of the Hellenistic world by sanctioning certain pagan practices including the new calendar. Confronted with the choice of worshipping in the Temple according to the new calendar or of withdrawing from the precincts of the holy city to find a retreat where it would be possible to observe the festivals as decreed by the Law, the Sectaries felt compelled to establish their own "house of holiness" for the worship of God. According to the author of the Damascus Document, those would survive in the final judgment who committed themselves to the observance of God's laws regarding his holy Sabbaths and festivals, but those who followed the dictates of the wicked Jerusalem priests would be destroyed. The intensity of this conflict is expressed particularly in the Habakkuk Commentary (11:3-8) where the Qumran author reports that the Wicked Priest appeared before the Teacher of Righteousness at the time of a festival of rest, the Day of Atonement, to confound the Sectaries and to make them stumble. Other references in the Scrolls which assert Qumran authority for the correctness of the dating of festivals reflect the bitterness of this controversy.⁶ Hence, it is not surprising to find as one of the injunctions for the Sectaries the command not to advance or postpone the times of the appointed festivals (DSD 1:11-15).

Fortunately the significance of the traditional festival year for the Sectaries and their reasons for preserving the ancient calendar are

⁴ In the Habakkuk Commentary the Wicked Priest appeared to confound the Sect at the time of their festival of rest, the Day of Atonement. Such references to "times" are made with regard to festivals by the author of Jubilees. The author of Daniel has apparently so used the term in connection with his reference to the Law.

⁵ On this aspect of the calendar problem, see M. Burrows, *More Light*, pp. 373-77, and K. Schubert, *The Dead Sea Community* (New York, 1959), pp. 57-58.

⁶ J. Obermann in his article on "Calendric Elements" referred to above has collected these passages and discussed their significance for the controversy.

indicated in the book of Jubilees, a work clearly identified as having Qumran approval by the author of the Damascus Document. One of the main objectives of the book of Jubilees is to stress the sanctity of the Qumran festival calendar by showing how the devout patriarchs had observed the feasts at the season decreed by God, how the majority of Israel had perished because of their wilful negligence in keeping the festivals, and how on Mount Sinai God had clearly revealed to Moses the division of the years for the keeping of the holy days. At Mount Sinai God had also predicted that this "calendar,"⁷ which was not of his own devising but written on heavenly tablets, would be forgotten by those who observed the feasts of the Gentiles according to their "calendar." The Israelites would assuredly make this prediction come to pass even though they saw how the moon disturbed the seasons and brought the year to an end ten days short of the solar year. "For this reason," God warned Moses, "the years will come upon them when they will disturb [the order], and make an abominable [day] the day of testimony, and an unclean day a feast day, and they will confound all the days, the holy with the unclean, and the unclean day with the holy; for they will go wrong as to the months and Sabbaths and feasts and jubilees" (Jub. 6:37). Hence the calendar of the Sectaries was not to be determined according to the current system of setting the festivals somewhat arbitrarily by the appearance of the new moon but by working out a more consistent harmonization of the solar-lunar calendar (cf. Enoch 72-82). For the Qumran community the year was divided into four seasons, with the first day of the seasons coinciding with the beginning of the first, fourth, seventh, and tenth months. Each season had three months, two of which had thirty days and the third thirty-one days, thus making a total of ninety-one days in each season and giving to the whole year three hundred and sixty-four days or fifty-two weeks of seven days each.⁸

⁷ See J. van Goudoever's excellent discussion of the Jubilee calendar in *Biblical Calendars*, pp 62-70.

⁸ The problem of the relationship of the solar and the lunar calendar has been under considerable debate. Burrows' solution, which takes into consideration the extensive details set forth in the Mishmaroth texts, recom-

While the regularity of such a calendar for the observance of festivals presented certain advantages for a religious organization, what is of greater interest is the Sectaries' conviction that their solar-lunar calendar was the ancient one, written, so they maintained, upon the tablets of heaven. The calendar with its seasons had first been revealed to Enoch who lived in the seventh generation after Adam (En. 4:17; cf. 72-82), then to the patriarchs, and finally to Moses who wrote down the commandments of the covenant for the future generations of Israel. Furthermore, they argued that the sun and not the moon took an undeviating and unfickle course across the sky. Thus it would seem that their chief concern was to adjust the lunar cycle to the solar. The sun never diminished in size and gave a light seven times brighter than the full moon, which at that time equaled the sun in size (En. 72-82). In his attempt to reform the calendar, the author of Jubilees emphasized that God had appointed the sun to be the great sign upon the earth to establish the seasons. Without difficulty, the Sectaries could find justification for their particular esteem of the sun in the literature of the Hebraic tradition, for the psalmists of the Old Testament had praised the splendor of the sun as it rules over the day and thus creates a marvelous harmony in the world of nature. The lyrical beauty of Psalm 19 in its comparison of the glory of the Law to that of the sun is without parallel in the Old Testament. Here the psalmist expresses a love for God's eternal Law which rules men's lives as the sun rules the world of nature.

The heavens are telling the glory of God;
and the firmament proclaims his handiwork.
Day to day pours forth speech,
and night to night declares knowledge,
There is no speech, nor are there words;
their voice is not heard;
yet their voice goes out through all the earth,
and their words to the end of the world.

mends itself as the most likely. He maintains that the Sect apparently operated with two calendars, the lunar and the solar, which were harmonized within six-year cycles (*More Light*, pp. 376-77).

In them he has set a tent for the sun,
 which comes forth like a bridegroom leaving his chamber,
 and like a strong man runs its course with joy.
 Its rising is from the end of the heavens,
 and its circuit to the end of them;
 and there is nothing hid from its heat.

The law of the Lord is perfect,
 reviving the soul;
 the testimony of the Lord is sure,
 making wise the simple;
 the precepts of the Lord are right,
 rejoicing the heart;
 the commandment of the Lord is pure,
 enlightening the eyes;
 the fear of the Lord is clean,
 enduring forever;
 the ordinances of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.

In a much longer hymn attached to the end of the Manual of Discipline, a Qumran psalmist has expressed similar wonder at the orderliness of cosmic harmony found in the regular movements of the sun, moon, and lesser lights across the vast expanse of the heavens. The reliable and predictable movements of the heavenly bodies declare the steadfast plan of God in the world. His decrees cannot be altered and have been determined from the very beginning of the created order. Although some of the psalmist's ideas and allusions are obscure and translations of the text vary widely, the two opening sections or stanzas of this psalm clearly deal with God's decree that the motion of the sun, moon, and stars mark the appropriate occasions for worship. The Qumran psalmist has, therefore, added an apologetic, and possibly a polemical, note to the canonical hymn in praise of the sun and the Law. In the first stanza of the Qumran psalm, the poet praises the sun's division of time into days which indicate the appropriateness of morning and evening as times of meditation, and he praises the sun's relationship to the appearance of the new moon as a particularly important occasion for worship. In the second stanza the poet extols the sun's division of time into larger units: the seasons and the years. Since

these opening stanzas are very significant expressions of the importance of the Qumran calendar, they should be quoted in their entirety. Comparison of this material with Psalm 19, quoted above, will also reveal the polemical character of the Qumran hymn.

With nothing but the will of God shall a man be concerned,
but with all the words of his mouth shall he be pleased;
he shall not desire anything which he did not command,
but to the ordinance of God he shall look always.

In every period that is to be he shall bless his Maker,
and in whatever state he is he shall tell of his righteousness.

With an offering of the lips he shall bless him
throughout the periods which *A* has decreed:
at the beginning of the dominion of light, through its circuit,
and at its ingathering to its decreed dwelling;
and at the beginning of the watches of darkness,
when he opens his treasury and appoints it for a time;
and at its circuit, together with its ingathering before the light,
when lights appear from the holy habitation,
together with their ingathering to the glorious dwelling;
at the coming in of seasons in days of the new moon,
both their circuit and their connection one with another.

When they renew themselves, the *M* is large for the holy of
holies;
and the letter *N* is for the key of his eternal, steadfast love.

At the heads of seasons in every period to be,
at the beginning of months for their seasons
and holy days in their fixed order,
for a memorial in their seasons,
with an offering of the lips I will bless him
as a decree engraved forever.

At the heads of years and in the circuit of their seasons,
when the circle of their fixed order completes the day ordained
for it,

one leading to another: the season of reaping to summer,
the season of sowing to the season of vegetation,
seasons of years to weeks of them,
and at the head of their weeks for a season of emancipation;
as long as I exist a decree engraved shall be on my tongue
for fruit of praise and for a gift of my lips.

I will sing with knowledge,
and all my music shall be for the glory of God;
my lyre and harp shall be for his holy fixed order,
and the flute of my lips I will raise
in his just circle.⁹

While the Qumran psalmist may have had Psalm 19 of the canonical collection of hymns in mind and may allude to certain familiar concepts and expressions such as extolling God's righteousness and his creative activity, declaring his intention to obey God's will steadfastly, and praising God on the harp and lyre, he has injected many ideas peculiar to his religious community into the ancient hymnic form. Particularly interesting are the mysterious letters *A* (Hebrew *aleph*), *M* (Hebrew *mem*), and *N* (Hebrew *nun*). Two suggestions about their meaning, appropriate to the central theme of this song sung to the glory of God throughout all the decreed periods of the solar-lunar year, are that together the three letters have the numerical value of ninety-one (the number of days given to each of the four seasons in the Qumran year); and that the letter *N*, having the value of fifty, symbolizes the mysterious harmony of the universe.¹⁰ The meaning the psalmist meant to convey by these esoteric details is not altogether clear. What is apparent, however, is the awe with which the psalmist regarded the orderliness of God's created world and his eternal plan to establish regular seasons for men to offer their praises to him. Throughout every period marked by the course of the sun, as well as by the periods related to the movement of the moon, the psalmist feels compelled to extol the Maker of the universe.

The Qumran psalmist differs from the canonical poet, not only in the first section of his psalm, where he has changed the sentiment from that of general praise of the created order to a form of polemical affirmation for the Sect's calendar, but also in the concluding

⁹ Manual of Discipline 10:1-9 (Burrows' translation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 384-85).

¹⁰ For a discussion of the meaning of the esoteric elements, see Dupont-Sommer, *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes* (New York, 1955), pp. 111-12, and M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 238-40.

section of the psalm. Here the Qumran psalmist has not taken up the theme of the Law and the justness of God's ordinances as one might expect. The conclusion of the Qumran psalm has the character of a private meditation in which the poet reflects upon the significance of his entrance into the Qumran community. He confesses his spiritual inadequacies and his necessary reliance upon God, whose faithfulness and strength empower him to live in an unfriendly and hostile world. God has illumined his mind so that he can gaze upon things eternal and understand the marvelous mysteries of divine knowledge. The Sectary, as he stands in awe of God's great cosmic order, responds with greater subtlety and depth of feeling than had the canonical psalmist. The majestic world of the heavens overwhelms him with a sense of his frail humanity. He is nothing but clay kneaded from the dust, a being who may easily stumble in the iniquity of his flesh. Nonetheless God in his mercy has placed the psalmist among the company of the elect because he has confessed that God is his righteousness, his foundation of goodness, the source of his knowledge, and the fountain of his holiness. Such a conclusion is indicative of the far from formal significance of the calendar for the members of the Sect. At the times decreed by God for worship and meditation, they responded to the divine order with profound depth of critical self-examination and of total commitment to God's demands and will.

Material in the book of Jubilees indicates not only the importance of maintaining the festivals according to the times set by the Qumran calendar but also the significance of each of the festivals. In this document the author has followed an ancient practice in Israel, namely that of reinterpreting the meaning of ceremonies celebrated at appointed times. Comparison of the Deuteronomic regulations for ritual celebrations with those of the Priestly Code indicates that the Hebraic tradition itself made such alterations. According to the Deuteronomic Code, the festivals were to be joyous celebrations commemorating Israel's deliverance from Egypt (Deut. 16:1-17). The Priestly Code, however, stressed the necessity of offering sacrifices upon these occasions to make full atonement for Israel's sins (Lev. 23). It further accented this shift in meaning by adding a ceremony to the calendar at this time, that of the Day of Atone-

ment. An examination of relevant details indicates that the Sectaries were also changing the significance of the traditional festivals to serve their devotional needs.

These alterations are remarkably interesting, for the Qumran author of the book of Jubilees not only has placed the origin of all the traditional festivals in the patriarchal period but also has given them thereby a new interpretation—an interpretation, however, which still remains within the bounds of the Hebraic tradition. The Day of Atonement was inaugurated as a day of mourning in Israel because on that day Jacob grieved at hearing the news about Joseph's cruel death (Jub. 34:12-19). Since all the sons of Jacob had collaborated in this crime, all the children of Israel were to continue to make atonement once a year on this day for the guilt of their forebears and for their own transgressions (Jub. 5:17-18). The Festival of Booths, or of Tabernacles, was associated by the Sectaries with the birth and sacrifice of Isaac and, as such, was interpreted by them to mean that God down through the ages would continue to provide for Abraham a pure and holy seed (Jub. 16:10-18:19; cf. Jub. 32:4-9). Their change in the interpretation of the two closely related festivals, Passover and Unleavened Bread, is not so clear, possibly because the episode had become so definitely associated with Israel's escape from Egypt under Moses' leadership. Goudoever, however, suggests, quite plausibly, that these two festivals may have been associated with Abraham's offering of Isaac and Isaac's redemption by the substitution of the ram.¹¹ The chief reason for moving the origin of these celebrations from the Mosaic period to

the patriarchs is apparently to stress the importance of the paternal bond established by God with the father of the Hebrew people. Added to that element is the intensification of the necessity of atonement for sins committed in the earliest period of history.

From the point of view of the Qumran author of the book of Jubilees, the supreme festival of the calendar year was the Feast of

¹¹ Goudoever also makes the interesting suggestion that the early Church in its simplification of the festival year, combined these two feasts (*Biblica Calendars*, pp. 68-69, 176-78).

Weeks or Pentecost, traditionally celebrated fifty days after Passover as an agricultural festival.¹² For the Sectaries, however, this festival assumed a "double nature" (Jub. 6:21-22). By associating it with the patriarchs and with Noah, the Sectaries brought out, as one of its purposes, God's establishment of a covenant through Noah with men of all nations and his promise to refrain from a second total destruction of mankind. But the association of this festival with the heavenly angels who had observed it from the day of creation because of its covenantal significance was of greater importance for the Sectaries. This dual reinterpretation of the rite by the Sectaries stressed the eternal character of the covenant-bond between God and righteous men, making it the pivotal festival of the religious year. Every year on this day men were to renew the covenant and so join the company of the heavenly host in commemorating God's establishment of a solemn compact with them. The generations after Noah, however, forgot the covenant and broke God's commandments by eating blood. God, therefore, withheld his covenant from the nations and renewed it only with the men of his choice: Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Jub. 14:10, 15:1-34, 22:1-24, 44:3-4). As a symbol of this eternal bond, Abraham and his descendants were to circumcise all males who were born into or entered into the covenant, for God had so created the angels of the presence and the angels of sanctification. Thereby God had given the sons of Israel a means by which they might be sanctified and thus might establish in their midst the house of the covenant and be with him and his holy angels. To this end Abraham prayed that God might give his son Jacob a seed of righteousness whose transgressions and sins of ignorance might be forgiven and that God might sanctify some of his sons in the midst of the whole earth, establishing them as a holy people. However, these ritual attempts to insure the continuity of the covenant-bond during the patriarchal era failed, for Israel was not reminded of her unique relationship to God.

¹² Milik, according to Burrows, has indicated the significance of this festival for the Qumran Sect and has found evidence for it in an unpublished fragment of the Damascus Document (*More Light*, pp. 377-78).

God's renewal of the covenant bond with Moses on the day of this festival at Mount Sinai was proof that he had resources for dealing with whatever might obstruct his purpose and that a unique quality of sanctity characterized the festival (Jub. 6:19). The Qumran author of the book of Jubilees found in Moses' ascent to the top of Mount Sinai the second significant purpose in the keeping of the Feast of Weeks. On this occasion God gave Moses the laws of the covenant, written on two tablets of stone, and commanded that Moses teach them to the sons of the covenant. On the Mount, God had also said to Moses, "Incline thine heart to every word which I shall speak to thee . . . and write them in a book in order that their generations may see how I have not forsaken them for all the evil which they have wrought in transgressing the covenant which I establish between me and thee for this generation on Mount Sinai" (Jub. 1:5). Hence the commandments were accompanied with the promise that God would not forsake his people in spite of their wickedness but would set in their midst a plant of righteousness. He would circumcise the foreskin of the hearts of the upright and create in them a holy Spirit. As the men of God's planting they would fulfil all God's commandments and would be called, therefore, the sons of the living God. In turn God promised to be their Father "in uprightness and righteousness" whose love for his children would be declared forever before the holy angels (Jub. 1:1-25). As sacred as were the other festivals of the religious year, this festival was of utmost importance for the Qumran Sect, because its "double nature" stressed the *covenant* and the *Law*.

Among the Sectaries a ceremony of major importance was that of entering and renewing the covenant (DSD 1:1-3:18). According to the Manual of Discipline, it was celebrated annually upon the occasion of admitting new members into the Sect and of reassigning positions of rank for all members on the basis of their achievements in understanding and in fulfilling the commandments of the Law. The priests and Levites officiated in performance of a liturgy in which blessings were pronounced by the priests and curses by the Levites. When the initiates entered the assembly, thus symbolizing their "passing into the covenant," the priests and Levites in unison began the liturgy of the ceremony by offering thanks to

God who desired men's salvation and performed righteous and truthful deeds. Then the priests recounted God's mighty deeds and all his acts of steadfast love and mercy. In contrast to this vision of God's majesty, the Levites portrayed the wickedness of Israel by rehearsing all her iniquities and transgressions. The worshiper responded by confessing his unworthiness and then expressed his sense of the removal of guilt and of hope in God for his salvation. This ceremony, therefore, expressed both repentance and trust:

We have committed iniquity, we have transgressed, we have sinned, we have done evil, we and our fathers before us, in walking contrary to the statutes of truth, but righteous is God, and true is his judgment on us and on our fathers; and the mercy of his steadfast love he has bestowed upon us from everlasting to everlasting.¹³

The ceremony closed with priestly blessings pronounced upon all who had entered the covenant with the desire to walk perfectly in God's way and with terrifying curses upon those who entered the covenant with improper motives. The initiates' assent, "Amen! Amen!" concluded the ceremony.

The traditional rather than the novel features of this ceremony have rightly impressed scholars. On the whole, it recalls the ceremony Moses commanded to be performed when the Israelites entered the land of Canaan (Deut. 27). In the ancient counterpart of the ritual, Moses and the Levites began the ceremony by declaring in unison that on this day, the day of passing over the Jordan and of entering the land, Israel had become God's people and that as his people they were obliged to obey his commandments. The pronouncement of blessings and of curses upon the tribes of Israel, followed by the congregational response "Amen," brought the ceremony to a close. Since the Sectaries found no priestly benediction recorded in this early rite, they looked elsewhere in their tradition for an appropriate liturgical form and found it in the "Aaronic" benediction. How closely they followed the ancient phrases of the

¹³ Manual of Discipline 1:24-2:1 (Burrows' translation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 372).

prayer can be illustrated by italicizing the words that are part of the earlier benediction.

May he *bless you* with all good and *keep you* from all evil;
May he *give light* to your heart with living wisdom and *be*
gracious to you with eternal knowledge;
May he *lift up his loving countenance to you* for eternal *peace*.¹⁴

The annual ceremony of entering and renewing the covenant, then, had its model in the ceremony of Israel's entrance into the promised land as narrated in the Law. As an expression of public worship and of congregational piety, it stressed the importance of the Law and of the covenant and the belief that by entering the Sect one had entered the community of the true Israel of God's promises. This, the highest ceremony of the festival year, therefore, furnishes evidence that the Sectaries adapted traditional expressions and forms of worship for their devotional needs.

By setting themselves apart from the rest of Jewry, the Sectaries were able to obey the commandments about the dates but not those concerning the place for sacrificial celebrations. They were forced, therefore, to set aside those decrees which stated that certain festivals must be celebrated in Jerusalem and that specified sacrifices must be offered to God in the Temple at the daily morning and evening services, and at the services for the Sabbath and special holy days.¹⁵ The withdrawal from Jerusalem and the predictions concerning the necessary destruction of the polluted Temple seem perhaps to represent a desire to sever all ties with the Temple itself and its sacrificial worship. Certainly in the major documents discovered in the Qumran caves the Sectaries neither lamented their separation from the sacrificial worship in the Temple nor expressed a longing for a change of circumstances that would make possible a resumption of the ancient sacred rites. When one turns to the book of Jubi-

¹⁴ The translation is that of Burrows who has also called attention to the alteration of the ancient benediction by means of italics (*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 248).

¹⁵ For a summary of recent discussion on the Sectaries' attitude toward sacrifice, see M. Burrows, *More Light*, pp. 363-65, 367; also Frank Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, pp. 74-77.

lees and to some of the fragments of manuscripts found in the caves, however, one notes that they still regarded Jerusalem as one of the three holy places created by God from eternity (Jub. 8:19). Similarly, the Temple placed on Mount Zion was God's eternal sanctuary where he would rule as king over the earth forever (Jub. 1:26-27). Their withdrawal from the Temple, like Jesus' act of driving the money-changers from the Temple area, was not a gesture of repudiation but one of the greatest veneration for the center of Jewish institutional worship. In both instances criticism of current sacrificial practices is implied.

Faced with this problem, the Sectaries again searched Scripture for a solution. In the days before Moses and the giving of the Law at Mount Sinai, the patriarchs, as pious exemplars, had offered sacrifices in various localities other than Jerusalem as expressions of thanksgiving and of atonement for the sins of the people. The Sectaries, however, lived in an era after God had commanded Moses that the only appropriate place for sacrificial worship was Jerusalem and in a period after the Temple had been built for that purpose. They were forced, therefore, to find a substitute in their own place of worship outside the environs of Jerusalem for the offering of suitable gifts to the God of Israel. Although scriptural precedent did not resolve the problem completely, the Old Testament suggested that prayer was a more acceptable offering to God than unworthy sacrifices (Prov. 15:8). Since the Wicked Priest of Jerusalem had defiled the sanctuary by immoral and irreligious acts and so rendered the Temple sacrifices unworthy, the Sectaries decreed that no man was "to send to the altar burnt offerings or meal offering or frankincense or wood by the hand of a man who is unclean with any of the uncleannesses, allowing him to make the altar unclean; for it is written, 'the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination, but the prayer of the righteous is like an acceptable offering.'"¹⁶ For the Sectaries, therefore, prayer, continual praise of God, and constant repetition of his commandments were "the offerings of the

¹⁶ The Qumran author quotes scriptural support (Prov. 15:8) for the substitution of prayer for sacrifice (Dam. Doc. 11:19-21 [Burrows' translation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 360]).

lips to God." The psalmist who wrote the hymn which closes the Manual of Discipline has expressed this conviction by saying that "as long as I exist a decree engraved shall be on my tongue / for fruit of praise and for a gift of my lips."¹⁷ Similarly, the author of Jubilees, who described in detail the offering of animal sacrifices, wrote that God "caused his commands to ascend as a sweet savour acceptable before him all the days" (Jub. 2:22).

Since the sacrifices offered in the Jerusalem Temple had lost the efficacy of atonement, the continuous study of the Law throughout the day and night and the offering of hymns and prayers at the decreed times for worship fulfilled the expiatory function of the Temple sacrifices. Consequently, the Sectaries not only substituted the prayers of the righteous for unworthy sacrifices but substituted their own community, "a holy house for Israel, a foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron," for the polluted sanctuary. The establishment of the Sectaries' house of the Law was a fulfilment of Ezekiel's prophecy, "the priests and the Levites and the sons of Zadok, who kept charge of my sanctuary when the sons of Israel went astray from me, they shall offer to me fat and blood" (Ezek. 44:15). According to Qumran interpretation of the biblical oracle, the priests in question were those who went from Judah to found the Qumran community; the Levites, those who came out to join them; and the sons of Zadok were "the elect of Israel, those called by name, who would abide at the end of days" (Dam. Doc. 4:2-4). According to God's plan, therefore, when it came to pass that wicked priests had defiled his holy sanctuary and when a small group of devout men were groping for the way of righteousness, he would cause a new holy of holies to be established

for a foundation of a holy spirit, for eternal truth, for a ransom for the guilt of transgression and sinful faithlessness, and for acceptance for the land more than the flesh of whole burnt offerings and the fats of sacrifice, and an offering of the lips for justice like the pleasing quality of righteousness, and perfect conduct like a willing gift of an acceptable offering;

¹⁷ Manual of Discipline 10:8 (Burrows' translation, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 385).

at that time the men of the community shall be set apart, a house of holiness for Aaron, to be united as a holy of holies and a house of community for Israel, those who conduct themselves blamelessly.¹⁸

The Qumran "holy of holies" with its offerings of the lips would not, however, be a permanent substitute for the Jerusalem Temple with its institutions for sacrificial worship, for this Temple had been created by God for eternity and the laws decreeing its worship were inscribed upon heavenly tablets for eternity. The Sectaries were assured that God would soon come to judge the wicked priests, to destroy them, and to cleanse the Temple of its impurities. On that day God would give back to the elect sons of Zadok the position that was rightfully theirs, the eternal priesthood in the newly cleansed Temple set upon the holy mountain of Jerusalem.

Although the Sectaries followed the traditional commandments, whenever possible, in their endeavor to attain eternal life, they also participated in a religious act of great solemnity that was not required by Old Testament Law. This celebration was the communal eating of a meal whose characteristic elements were bread and wine. According to Josephus, the Sectaries entered the refectory to participate in the celebration as though they were going to a place of worship. They prepared themselves for it by ritual ablutions and by putting on sacred garments of white linen. The lustration itself had no sacramental value but symbolized that the participants had vowed to turn from evil and to devote themselves to the performance of God's commands. Unless one had first determined to renounce the ways of Belial and to cleave to the ways of the covenant, the act did not have the power of cleansing from sin. Water, even though abundantly supplied by seas and rivers, would not wash away impurity (DSD 9:13-14). The effectiveness of ablutions depended upon the prior submission of one's soul to God and upon its consequent humility and uprightness. Thus prepared for participation in the sacred meal the Sectaries entered the refectory according to their assigned ranks. The priests led the procession and were fol-

¹⁸ Manual of Discipline 9:3-6 (Burrows' translation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 383).

lowed by the Levites and the men of Israel. According to the Manual of Discipline, a priest pronounced a blessing over the first portion of the bread and wine before the meal was eaten (DSD 6:4-6). While it is hoped that further work on the fragments of manuscripts discovered will contribute to a more precise understanding of the religious function and purpose of the common meal, it may be stated tentatively that the meal had some kind of eschatological or messianic significance for the Sect.¹⁹

A significant, if fragmentary, text which refers to the meal and which may suggest its messianic character reads as follows:

[This is (the order) of the ses]sion of the "Men of the Name who are [invited] to the Feast" for the communal council when [God] sends the Messiah to be with them:

[The Priest] shall enter [at] the head of all the congregation of Israel and all the fa[thers of] the Aaronids . . . and they shall sit be[fore him each] according to his rank.

Next the [Messi]ah of Israel [shall enter], and the heads of the thou[sands of Israel] shall sit before him [ea]ch according to his rank. . . .

[And] they shall sit before the (two) of them, each according to his rank. . . .

W[hen th]ey solemnly meet together [at a tab]le of communion [or to drink the w]ine, and the common table is arranged [and the] wine [is mixed] for drinking, one [shall not stretch out] his hand to the first portion of the bread or [of the wine] before the priest; for [he shall b]less the first portion of the bread and the wi[ne and shall stretch out] his hand to the bread first of all. Nex[t] the Messiah of Israel shall [str]etch out his hand to the bread. [Next] all the congregation of the

¹⁹ Burrows quite correctly raises doubts about the possible sacramental character of this meal. However, he seems unduly cautious in questioning the possibility of its eschatological and messianic character (see *More Light*, pp. 368-71). The argument presented by Frank Cross in his discussion of the pertinent Qumran material suggests the probability that the meal had this significance. Since the theme of the messianic banquet appears in eschatological sections of the Old Testament, a sacred meal so celebrated by the Qumran Sect seems quite probable (see *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, pp. 62-67, 177-79).

Community [shall give tha]nks (and partake), each according to his rank.

And they shall act according to this prescription whenever (the meal) [is arr]anged, when as many as ten solemnly meet together.²⁰

The meal apparently was celebrated in anticipation of the Messiah's coming, for a reference is made to the expected appearance of the Anointed One. Since his advent would mark the end of the present age and the inauguration of God's restoration and redemption of the true Israel, the repetition of the rite must have been one of great emotional excitement for the eschatologically oriented Sect of Qumran. Although the officiating priest had a position superior to that of the Messiah, nevertheless the messianic character of the celebration differentiates this rite from those commanded by the Old Testament. The innovation, therefore, is apparently a notable departure from traditional ceremonies but an understandable development in the light of references to eschatological banquets in documents of the Old Testament.

To date, the repertoire of liturgical versicles, psalms, collections of benedictions and prayers found at Qumran has not been published in its entirety. In addition to the published collection of Psalms of Thanksgiving, there exist an "angelic liturgy" appropriate for the apocalyptic views expressed in Enoch, certain apocryphal psalms of Joshua, and liturgical materials which quote Old Testament psalms and prophets. Some of these unpublished psalms, contrary to the ones now known, seem to be particularly suitable for public rather than private devotions. They are not characterized by an intimate devotional tone, but are rehearsals of events of Israel's history. Another unpublished collection, worthy of note, consists of liturgical lamentations over Jerusalem that are comparable to, but not identical with, the dirges in the canonical Book of Lamentations.

From the benedictions already published, it seems likely that in certain services of worship blessings may have been pronounced

²⁰ The translation is that of Frank Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, pp. 64-65.

upon the faithful, the priests, the high priests, and the prince of the congregation.²¹ The faithful, who believed in God, did his will, kept his laws, and preserved the holy covenant, expressed in them the hope that God might bless them from his holy dwelling by establishing them as an eternal foundation, grant them the learning of the eternal saints, and never prevent them from satisfying their thirst from God's life-giving waters. The benediction upon the priests requested that God make his priests diligent servants in the Temple of the Kingdom, allow them to participate in the lot of the angels, and grant them knowledge that would illuminate the multitudes. Similarly, the benediction upon the prince of the congregation requested that God give him power to renew the covenant of the community, restore the kingdom of Israel, judge the poor justly, rule the humble with equity, and be given a scepter to free the land from tyrants. What the nature of the ceremonies was at which these blessings could have been used is not clear. In any case, these benedictions, and the patriarchal benedictions interspersed throughout the book of Jubilees, express the hopes of the Qumran community in the traditional language of Old Testament benedictions. Amplifying alterations have been made to give the ancient forms a significance adequate to new devotional requirements.

Although evidence of the Sectaries' use of psalms, hymns, and prayers for public worship is scanty, it can safely be assumed that such materials must have played a part in their formal acts of devotion. The Sectaries' veneration for the worship at the Temple, as practiced in the pre-Maccabean era, suggests that they continued to use the traditional hymnic material for the celebrations of the Sabbath and of other holy days. What they did was to substitute prayers and psalms as "offerings of the lips" for the customary sacrifices commanded by the Law. Since they believed that their own Sect was the link between the former Temple with its prescribed ritual and the purified Temple of the future, the Sectaries must have felt a sense of responsibility for preserving the liturgical usage of their hymnic heritage.

²¹ For a translation of these benedictions as well as prayers, see Burrows' *More Light*, pp. 396-400.

One concludes from this survey of the Sectaries' ceremonial acts and devotional observance that they were largely dependent upon traditional forms. They cherished their heritage of worship as a means of expressing a sense of moral and spiritual inadequacy and as a way of reaffirming the hope that God would pardon their sins and renew their spiritual strength by the gift of his holy Spirit, thus rededicating their lives to serve God with singleness of purpose and with loyal obedience. In the light of their understanding of the Old Testament commandments, the Sectaries maintained that God had given to Israel certain unalterable rites which must be performed by his appointed priests in the place sanctified for this purpose. The rites, properly performed, would bring salvation and eternal life, not because the correct performance in itself had sacramental power to remove guilt and to restore life, but because they awakened in men the desire to dedicate themselves wholly to the purpose for which they had been created. This purpose was complete obedience to all God's commandments. While circumstances and new developments of religious thought within the Sect contributed to new interpretations of certain ceremonies, particularly to the Feast of Weeks, even these new elements were derived from the tradition and, in fact, increased the significance of the tradition by stressing the importance of the covenant and of the Law. Their response to the commandments controlling their acts of worship, as their response to the ethical laws of the Old Testament, had become so intense that the Sectaries condemned Israel for her departure from the tradition and established their own Qumran "house of holiness." Their only real departure from the traditional pattern of worship was the celebration of a common meal which may have had an eschatological and messianic significance and which, if such was the case, is very important for an understanding of the eucharistic rite celebrated by the Christian community at Jerusalem.

Any attempt to describe the elements of early Christian worship for purposes of comparison with Qumran is rendered difficult by the nature of the New Testament record itself. No New Testament document contains a polemic against current acts of devotion, such as appears in the book of Jubilees. Indeed, references to Christian ceremonies and liturgical formulas are rare and generally occur in

contexts dealing with problems of the Church other than worship. While the scholars of the "form-critical school" have showed us how to differentiate between the original function of transmitted materials and the use made of them in their present literary contexts, it has applied its method particularly to the discovery of the kind of sermon material used by early Christian preachers. Much must still be done with the poetic and formal elements of the New Testament documents if we are to gain an understanding of Christian prayers, hymns, confessions, and doxologies, and of the function which they had in services of Christian worship. What one would expect to find in this field is that the Palestinian and the Hellenistic Christian communities each had their own type of worship. That is, that the Palestinian community would have retained more of the traditional elements of Jewish religious practice and that the Hellenistic community would have sought new forms to express new experiences of a life guided by the Spirit. Such differences, however, are readily blurred, and it is not always easy to reconstruct or even see them.

The one direct comment we have about early Christian worship in Palestine is Luke's brief statement that the members of the church in Jerusalem "devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers," and that, "day by day, attending the temple together and breaking bread in their homes, they partook of food with glad and generous hearts, praising God and having favor with all people" (Acts 2:42, 46). While one might wish that this first historian of the Church had given a more detailed picture of the devotional life of its members in general and of their private gatherings in particular, what he has reported indicates that after Easter this earliest Christian community participated in the traditional services at the Temple with their fellow Jews and at the same time held private meetings of a more informal and intimate nature. There is no indication here that the Christian community of Jerusalem wished to break with official Judaism either on the grounds that the Church could not remain faithful to the ceremonial traditions of the Old Testament or that Judaism, by falsely accusing Jesus of wanting to destroy the Temple and by crucifying him, had made it impossible for them to partici-

pate in the ancient rites of their people. As long as the members of the Jerusalem church continued to live as law-abiding Jews, did not become a disturbing element within Judaism by their confession of Jesus as their Messiah, and remained a small and harmless group, the religious authorities permitted them to worship in the Temple as Jews of good standing and in their own homes as a small synagogal group. This group, then, though small and ultimately inconsequential, did continue its loyalty to the ancient traditions and must at the same time have created materials for its own particular devotional needs.

For the members of the Hellenistic Christian community, the allegiance to the traditional cult was untenable. Participation in the observances of a religious calendar that included a Day of Atonement contradicted their conviction that Jesus by his death had once and for all time made atonement for men's sins. Since the earliest representatives of this more vocal and critical group of Christian converts was forced out of Jerusalem by Jewish authorities, it had to find other means of worship and another institutional orientation for its devotional life. In this respect the Hellenistic Christian group both resembled and differed from the Qumran Sect. It differed because it made Christ and not the Law of the Old Testament the basis of its devotional life and because it regarded the Christian community itself, or Jesus, as the new dwelling place of God which replaced the old cultic order (II Cor. 6:19, I Cor. 3:10-16; cf. Jn. 2:19-21). It resembled the Qumran Sect because it also turned its back on the sacrificial cult at the Temple. As we have seen, the Qumran group thought of its separation from the Temple as temporary. Hence the break of the Hellenistic church with the institutional forms of Jewish worship was more drastic than the Sect's and prevented it from looking to the possibility of a return to a purified Temple in Jerusalem, even should it be under the control of a holy priesthood of the true Israel.

What can be learned from the New Testament documents about the perpetuation of traditional observance in the nascent Church is very meager. One thing we do know is that it continued to observe one day out of seven as a holy day. The day, however, was not the Sabbath, sanctified by God as a day of rest from labor, but was the

first day of the week, the day of Christ's resurrection.²² Christian worship on that day did not revolve around the appropriate sacrifices commanded by the Law but probably around the unique rite of breaking bread together and, according to Pliny, of singing hymns to Christ as God. Such hymns in the literature of the New Testament as the songs praising Christ as the slain Lamb (Rev. 5:9-10), as the Bridegroom of the Church (Rev. 19:7-8), as the exalted Servant (Phil. 2:6-11), and as the revealing and redeeming Word of God (Jn. 1:1-5, 10-11, 14, 16) would have been appropriate for such occasions.

From Paul's Letter to the Corinthians, it would seem that services in Corinth were much less formal than those which had been familiar to Paul as a Jew and those in which the members of the Jerusalem church participated. Every member was free to speak as he was moved by the Spirit, to offer a hymn, a lesson, a revelation, an ecstatic utterance, or an interpretation. Paul, however, laid down one restriction. Everything should be done for the mutual edification of all members, and no one should use the service of worship as an occasion for exhibitionism. To speak ecstatically was useful in arousing the interest of non-believers that they might be brought into the Church. But it was not a useful contribution to services of worship and it could create a wrong impression.

As the significance of the weekly congregational meetings was given a Christian reinterpretation, so also the celebration of the biblical Passover. This no longer expressed a hope for the deliverance of the nation but rather a hope for the deliverance of every individual. Since, at the time of a Passover celebration, Jesus had given his life in place of the paschal lamb and on the first day of the week had been raised from the dead, he had the power to renew life for all who believed on him. Indeed, the significance of Jesus' death and resurrection was so important an aspect of Paul's religious outlook that he interpreted the meaning of the Feast of Unleavened Bread from this perspective in the following complicated allegory.

²² See Hans Lietzmann, *Geschichte der alten Kirche* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1932), trans. B. L. Woolf, as *The Beginnings of the Christian Church* (2d ed.; London, 1937), pp. 68-69; also Goudoever, *Biblical Calendars*, pp. 164-75.

Your boasting is not good. Do you not know that a little leaven ferments the whole lump of dough? Cleanse out the old leaven that you may be fresh dough, as you really are unleavened. For Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed. Let us, therefore, celebrate the festival, not with the old leaven, the leaven of malice and evil, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.²³

In this allegorical interpretation Paul suggests that renewal of life, conceived of in ethical terms, is the purpose of the Christian's celebration of the rite. To make this transformation possible, Christ himself took the place of the paschal lamb. The Christian Church, therefore, found material in the Jewish observance of the Sabbath and of Passover, which could serve its devotional needs. As it reinterpreted these ceremonies to fit its religious point of view, the figure of Christ more and more illumined its worship. He was the Lord of the weekly congregational meetings by virtue of his resurrection on the first day, and he brought renewal of life at the yearly commemoration of his death and resurrection.

Luke's report of the Church's experience at Pentecost suggests that it gave the Jewish Feast of Weeks a Christian reinterpretation, which is of great interest not only because it gives some clue regarding the possible significance of this religious celebration in the Christian calendar of Luke's generation but also because it provides material for a comparison of the Christian reinterpretation of Pentecost with that of the Sectaries. The Sectaries had appropriated this annual celebration for the occasion of entering and renewing the covenant.²⁴ Consequently, they associated the origin of its celebration, on earth, with events in the lives of the patriarchs and, in heaven, with the angels, who had observed it from the day of creation. Thus the Sectaries made it one of the most sacred of their festivals. Since God had made and renewed his covenant with the

²³ I Cor. 5:6-8. See Goudoever's discussion in *Biblical Calendars*, pp. 176-81.

²⁴ Goudoever in his discussion of the Feast of Weeks calls attention to the unique interpretation of this festival in the book of Jubilees. The emphasis upon the covenant and the Law is not to be found in the celebration of the Feast of Weeks within the main stream of Judaism until the second or third century A.D. (*Biblical Calendars*, pp. 191-92).

patriarchs and had given his Law of the covenant to Moses on that day, the Law and the covenant defined the particular significance of Pentecost. Luke indicates that Pentecost, or the Feast of Weeks, had a specific historical importance for the Church. It was the day on which the Church as a missionary movement had its origin. Luke associated this feast with the leaders of the Christian movement as the Sectaries had associated it with the patriarchs. By designating the pentecostal episode as the occasion for the founding of the Church and by attributing to Peter a sermon which concerned the Spirit's gathering of the elect into the Church, Luke interpreted the significance of the feast in the light of God's covenant promises. While the Sectaries maintained that on the day of the festival Moses ascended Mount Sinai to receive the Torah as God's greatest gift to men, Luke reports Peter as saying that Jesus had been exalted to the right hand of God to receive from the Father the promise of the holy Spirit which he now poured out upon the apostles (Acts 2: 33). Pentecost, for the Church of Luke's generation, was not the day for the entering and renewal of the covenant through obedience to the Law but a time of renewal through the reception of the holy Spirit. Pentecost, therefore, was the second Jewish festival which the early Church considered appropriate for incorporation in its ecclesiastical calendar.

Further evidence for the importance of the pentecostal celebration may be found in the Fourth Gospel. The "high priestly" prayer may have provided liturgical material used by the Christian community of which the Fourth Evangelist was a member and may give further indication of the significance of the pentecostal season at the close of the New Testament period. The prayer is petitionary in form and has Christ request certain things for himself, the Son (Jn. 17:1-5), for the community of present believers (17:6-19), and for the continuing community of believers (17:20-26). The Son, as the Incarnate Word, has finished his earthly task (17:4; cf. 19:30), the complete and final revelation of God to men, and now asks for the clear manifestation of his power over all flesh and of his ability to give eternal life to all men given to him by the Father. The moment of glorification, his ascent to the Father, will be the final sign. The Son looks forward with joy to that which the imminent future

holds for him. The community of believers may expect the same joy upon the completion of its work. Hence they need not regard their life in the world without the visible presence of the Revealer as a cause of despair but as an event of momentous importance for their salvation. Since the Son, as the revealing agent of salvation, or the mystagogue, could communicate glory, life, and oneness with God, and could authorize a group to continue this work, the Church, which has been given the same task, may expect God to relate himself to the Church as he had to the Son. As the Son had accomplished his task because he was and continues to be a part of the eternal order of God, so the Church may expect to participate in that eternal order. The departure of the Son, then, opens up a new type of existence for the community of believers.

While this prayer and the Dead Sea Scrolls regard the separation from the world of the eternal, holy, and elect community as necessary for salvation, the thought of the prayer does not suggest the separation as originating in the adherence to a way of righteousness. Salvation has been mediated through the Son, who has given the word of God to the Church, not through revealed laws requiring strict and correct observance of ritual and ethics. The Son, as the agent of salvation, does not communicate *halakah* (interpretation of the commandments) but *gnosis* (knowledge) to his disciples. The way of salvation is not repentance for sins but the higher, mystical experience in which the Son participated when he was with God. Like Mithras, the Son gives the key to open up the eternal world of the Spirit, frees men from the limitations of the present world, becomes the agent for the Church to enjoy the beatific vision of the world to which he belongs, and grants to his disciples and to their converts a new kind of spiritual existence, that of *doxa* (glory). Such salvation is not Pauline in its conception, for it expresses a reflective and non-active type of God-mysticism. Hence, the Christian community which created this prayer for formal liturgical usage is not concerned, as others were, with the problem of Jesus' death or with his failure to give guidance on practical matters. During this pre-pentecostal period, the Revealer was thought of as about to fulfil the function of mediating the beatific vision for all time. The prayer thus deals with themes significant for the Qumran celebra-

tion of Pentecost.²⁵ The essential themes are those of revelation, through which salvation is mediated, and the elect community of those who will be granted the revelation. The Sectaries emphasized the role of the Law in this connection while the Christian liturgist and Luke emphasized the role of Christ, who upon his departure sent to his followers the gift of the holy Spirit.

While evidence from the documents of the New Testament concerning the feasts of the ecclesiastical year is not very impressive, it does suggest that the early Church may at least have considered the possibility of reshaping the Jewish religious year and its festivals for its own devotional needs. Compared with the Sectaries, who had made the calendar a major issue of conflict between their organization and that of official Judaism, the early Church devoted little, if any, of its energies in that direction. The instructions in the *Didache* (8:1) that Christians were not to fast on the two weekly fast days of the "hypocrites" (the Jews), but were to fast on two other days of the week, show that the Church was both adopting and opposing Jewish observance. Interpretations of the significance of the Sabbath, Passover, and Pentecost may reflect this same point of view. In the Gospel according to John there may be an undercurrent of polemic in the section dealing with the Jewish festivals (Jn. 5-12). But here the polemical element does not concern the dates for the observation of festivals; rather, the author is concerned with the significance of the rites. As Bacon has pointed out, the Fourth Evangelist devoted the major section of his work to explaining how Jesus' coming had revolutionized the significance of the traditional celebrations.²⁶ Jesus, not the *mazzah* (unleavened bread), was the life-giving bread of the Passover festival. At the celebration of Pentecost, or the Feast of Weeks, Jesus, not the Law, was to be regarded as the highest authority. He gave the true light at the Festival of Tabernacles and

²⁵ In this connection Goudoever's comment that the Fourth Evangelist has brought in the pentecostal theme in John 20:21-22 is of great interest. In fact the pentecostal themes apparently pervade the second section of the Gospel according to John (chaps. 13-20).

²⁶ Benjamin Bacon has suggested this structural arrangement of the material in *The Gospel of the Hellenists*, ed. C. H. Kraeling (New York, 1933), pp. 138-39.

renewed life for all individuals believing on him at the time of Hanukkah. While the evangelist's symbolic interpretation of the Jewish festivals cannot be used as evidence that the Church appropriated all the festivals of the Jewish calendar, it indicates that even a symbolic treatment of ritual was dominated by the figure of Christ. Herein lay the essential difference between the Sectaries and the early Church. The Sectaries tried to maintain the ancient customs of worship and to interpret their significance within the limits of their traditional heritage. The Church, on the other hand, was impelled to create new forms and new media of liturgical expression that would convey to converts from diverse regions of the Greco-Roman world the meaning of Jesus Christ for its life and thought.

During the early period of Christianity, the devotional needs of the Church could not be met as adequately by a revision and a re-interpretation of the festivals of the Jewish religious year as by the creation, or possibly adaptation, of certain other rites comparable in some respects to ceremonies celebrated by the Sectaries. The first was the rite of entrance into the Christian community, namely baptism. The second rite was the common meal, the distinctive elements of which were bread and wine. The Church found the origins of both ceremonies in events of Jesus' life, but in spite of this fact the rites were not understood in the same way by all Christian communities. Indeed, the variety of interpretations indicates that the Church of the New Testament period regarded uniformity in its formal acts of worship as a secondary consideration. What mattered was the operation of the Spirit in connection with the rites, and the Church could no more obstruct the Spirit's guidance in devotional acts and gestures than in ethical decisions and actions.

According to Luke's history of the early Church, the rite of baptism was at first an informal ceremony of initiation for new members not necessarily associated with the use of water. The general impression which Luke conveys is that baptism by water is performed as a symbol of the individual's reception of the holy Spirit, but that unless the initiate had received the gift of the Spirit the water baptism had no value. In fact, he reports that the risen Christ had said to his disciples, "John baptized with water but before many

days you shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 1:5). Paul himself had become a member of the Church merely by the reception of the holy Spirit when Ananias laid his hands upon him. Comparable to the Qumran rite of entering the community were the elements of repentance, with the concomitant anticipation of forgiveness of sins, and instruction in a way of life. The Christian community, however, did not designate a length of time which the novice must spend in preparation for entrance but permitted immediate acceptance of the convert into the movement. Essentially, the requirement for membership in the Christian community was belief in the Lord Jesus Christ or in his name supported by some concrete evidence that the convert had received the gift of the holy Spirit (Acts 2:28, 8:12-24, 9:17, 10:44-48, 15:9, 16:31-33). Having been given this gift, the individual thus became a member of an eschatological community in which the prophecy of God was coming to fulfilment (Acts 2:17). The rite, therefore, was not limited to Jews who sought to obey all God's commandments but permitted to all—Jew and Gentile alike—who believed that in Jesus could be found a new hope of salvation.

As time went on, however, the Church came to regard the rite as having a quasi-sacramental significance. The first evidence of this interpretation of the rite appears in the letters of Paul, particularly in the Letter to the Romans (Rom. 6:1-4). To understand the statement, we must consider the context in which the interpretation is given. Paul is concerned here, first of all, with the new order that Christ initiates and that supersedes the older order of Judaism. The change is part of a divinely ordained plan for mankind. The appearance of Christ signified the end of an era that had begun with Adam. Christ, the second Adam, inaugurated a new age for all mankind. Paul then considers how the individual can become a member of this new order. The answer is, by means of the rite of baptism (Rom. 6:1-4). Adam's fall, Paul argues, exercised a compulsion upon man; it made him sin and thus brought about his death. Death, then, was the penalty of sin for Adam and all his descendants. What the individual must experience, if he wishes to be delivered from the power of sin and to belong to the new order initiated by Christ, is to die and yet live again. This death and resur-

rection occurred in the Christian rite of baptism. Baptism was the act of dying with Christ and, by virtue of the act itself, the sinful man, as an individual of the old order, died. During the baptism the convert not only entered the tomb with Christ, he also rose with him. But the "newness of life" was not automatically achieved. It was the purpose, not the result of the rite. Paul, then, did not continue the compulsive force of the first part of the analogy; having risen with Christ, the believer becomes a new man only by the special gift of God. Paul did not, therefore, regard the act of baptism as completely sacramental (*ex opere operato*) in its power to renew life for the individual. Had he so interpreted the rite, he would have affirmed that the performance of the rite itself had power both to destroy every convert's old "Adam" and to create the new man.

The author of the Fourth Gospel went beyond Paul and gave the baptismal rite full sacramental power. The shift in meaning is seen most clearly in the evangelist's account of Nicodemus' conversation with Jesus on the subject of entrance into the Kingdom of God (Jn. 3). Nicodemus, introduced in the narrative as thoroughly trained in the Hebraic tradition, has apparently opened the conversation by asking how one can enter the Kingdom of God. So phrased, the question concerns the realization of the Jewish hopes for the future of the nation. In reply, Jesus states that what is required before one can realize this hope is rebirth. In other words, what is required is a change in the nature of a man's being. So long as man is flesh, the Fourth Gospel insists, his interests are normally physical in nature. Though he may strive with all his heart and mind to be righteous, he can only achieve a perfection that is human and material. This frustration cannot be prevented, for man is born with these limitations. Therefore, so the evangelist argues, in order to experience the fulfilment of his religious hopes man must enter an order of being completely different from that of his natural and physical state and must make an entirely new beginning. These statements attributed to Jesus can be understood only against the background of Pauline developments of Christian thought in which two sets of concepts are contrasted: first, the vain efforts to achieve salvation by obeying the Law; and, second, the antithesis between the impotent hopelessness of life, which Paul had

experienced as a Pharisee, and the sense of being a "new creature" through Christ. These antitheses are presupposed in the Nicodemus story, but the transition from the old to the new order is inherent in the process and normative for the experience of salvation. This goes beyond Paul's quasi-sacramentalism.

According to the Fourth Evangelist, it was not an ethical change but a change in one's being or essential nature, that was required for salvation. For a Jew with Nicodemus' training and background, such an experience was both inconceivable and impossible. The evangelist, however, declares that the transition can occur by means of the rite of baptism. He maintains that baptism is not a repetition of physical birth but is a birth into an order quite different from man's first birth. This new beginning is necessary to make the individual a member of a new order of being. The evangelist affirms, too, that the spiritual birth is as real as was the physical. Since participation in the act of baptism itself can change man completely in his very being and nature, the rite is fully sacramental (*ex opere operato*) in character.

We have, therefore, a long development in the Christian conception of the significance of the baptismal rite. At first it had been an act of initiation into a fellowship and was associated with the gift of the holy Spirit. Then the rite came to typify the transition from one condition of being to another. Finally, for the author of the Fourth Gospel, the rite became the instrument by which that transition was achieved and was so real an event that it divided men into two groups, those who moved on the material level of ordinances and commandments to achieve piety and those who were of the order of the Spirit. Men became the children of God because they "were born, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God" (Jn. 1:13).

Because the Sectaries, John the Baptist, and the early Church all shared in the use of a baptismal rite, parallels have been noted and scholars have pointed out the influences of the Qumran rite upon John's use of the rite and through John upon that of the early Church. To be sure, all these individuals and groups used baptism for the initiation of new members into the several religious movements. They also agreed on the importance of a spiritual renewal

connected with the event of baptism. By stressing the parallels, however, scholars have been led to minimize the importance of the differences. As has already been noted, the Qumran rite emphasized the spiritual and moral willingness of the participant to obey the Law. The rite of cleansing the body served merely as the symbol of a soul previously cleansed by the performance of outstanding deeds which themselves reflected the individual's purity of thought and his intention to obey God's laws. If Josephus correctly understood the significance of John's use of the baptismal rite, namely that it was not "used to beg off from sins already committed, but for the purification of the body when the soul had previously been cleansed by righteous conduct," then John practiced the rite for the same purposes as did the Sectaries. However, evidence from the New Testament suggests that Josephus misrepresented John's baptism and that the rite was used by him to express his eschatological outlook. John may be said, rather, to have used the rite of water baptism to prefigure in symbolic fashion the fiery baptism of God's final judgment. An individual coming to John to be baptized in the Jordan enacted in advance his willingness to submit himself to God the judge. Hence the purpose of John's rite was to ask men to confess their past sins, to place themselves in the present before the ultimate tribunal of God, and to realize that only by repentance and obedience to God could they hope to be delivered from the disaster of God's adverse judgment.²⁷

In contrast to the baptism of the Sectaries and of John, the rite in Christian usage and interpretation became ever more closely associated with the person and significance of Christ. The thought of the new beginning in and through Christ, which we have traced through Paul and the Fourth Gospel, may be reflected also in the synoptic account of Jesus' own baptism, and there particularly in what is said about the descent of the Spirit as a dove (Mk. 1:10). The meaning of this all-important detail has been variously interpreted, but the interpretation that recommends itself most strongly is that based on the analogy to the story of creation, where the Spirit

²⁷ See C. H. Kraeling, *John the Baptist* (New York, 1951), pp. 95-122, esp. pp. 114-22.

of God hovers over the waters of chaos and gives them the power to produce life. As the Spirit in the first instance had created order and life in chaos, so it had acted again at the occasion of Jesus' baptism to make him the beginning of a new order in which he and his followers lived. For the Church this was indeed the key to the interpretation of the rite. In baptism, the Church felt, it had been brought from a world of darkness into a world of light and from a world of the dead to a world of life. The significance of the experience is so stated in the early liturgical versicle:

Awake, O sleeper, and arise from the dead,
and Christ shall give you light.²⁸

The second rite celebrated by all members of the Christian community was a common meal, a rite which had become particularly sacred to them because of its direct association with Jesus. On the night that he was betrayed, as he was eating with his disciples, he took the bread, broke it and gave it and the cup of wine to his disciples (Mk. 14:22-25). As described in gospel tradition, this last meal was an act of unusual solemnity. Yet the references to its Christian repetition in Acts and in Paul's Letter to the Corinthians indicates that the various Christian communities felt as free to interpret its meaning as they had the meaning of the baptismal rite. Two different interpretations emerge in the documents of the New Testament, one apparently reflecting the devotional needs of the Palestinian church; and the other, those of the Christian communities in the Hellenistic world.

In his history of the apostolic Church, Luke records that the members of the Jerusalem community broke bread together daily with glad and generous hearts (Acts 2:46). This is in keeping with their eschatological outlook. They looked forward with joy to the imminent return of Jesus, their Messiah, upon the clouds of glory. His return was to be the moment when he would gather his elect to be with him and to share with him the glory which he had with the Father. The hope that the members of the Church might be gathered together with the glorified and risen Christ is associated with the sacred meal also in the Didache (Did. 9:4). There the

²⁸ Eph. 5:14.

celebration of the eucharist is made to express the idea that as the grain had been brought together from the hillsides to produce the bread of the meal, so the members of the Church from all the world might be united with their Lord, Jesus Christ.

Of the various accounts of Jesus' last meal with his disciples, the Lukan version in its shorter form most adequately brings out this note of eschatological hope and joy and would have been appropriate for devotional use among the Palestinian churches:

And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he said, "Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I tell you that from now on I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes." And he took bread, and when he had given thanks he broke it and gave it to them, saying, "This is my body."²⁹

Conceivably these words of Jesus at the last supper, which expressed his expectation of repeating the celebration at the coming of the Kingdom, were the bases of this hope and joy. As the members of the church of Jerusalem repeated the words he had spoken, they renewed the hope of their reunion with him. This account of the last supper, which emphasizes eschatological hope and not the propitiatory character of the rite, corresponds with the joyous nature of its continued celebration in the Jerusalem church (Acts 2:46-47). There is here no thought of sacramentalism.

Since the religious hopes of the Christian communities in the Hellenistic world sprang not so much from an eschatological outlook as from an understanding of life under the Spirit's guidance, it was inevitable that their celebration of the eucharist should be accommodated to this point of view.

One can trace the importance of this change by its effect on Paul's thinking. He had originally instructed his first converts to look forward to the time when the Church would be caught up in the clouds to meet the returning Messiah (I Thess. 4:17). However, as his religious thinking deepened, he came to believe that the Christian lived, not only in expectation of a reunion with Christ, but also in the realization of a present union of his life with that of

²⁹ Luke 22:17-19.

Christ. Paul, therefore, could say that he now lived with Christ, and, at the same time, that he longed to die in order that he might be with Christ. Both of these elements appear in Paul's account of the Church's celebration of the eucharist. While he retained an element of the eschatological outlook which dominated the rite for the Palestinian church, this element was no longer the most significant feature of its celebration for him or for the circles in which he moved. Instead, Paul and those influenced by him, the authors of the Gospels according to Matthew and Mark, have interpreted the ceremony in terms of the propitiation for sins through Jesus' death and the establishment of a new covenant:

For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, "This is my body which is broken for you. Do this in remembrance of me." In the same way also the cup, after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me." For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes.⁸⁰

His tradition, as contrasted with the Lukan tradition, adds after the words of Jesus, "this is my body," the interpretative element, "broken for you." In connection with the cup, too, one finds that it is "the cup of the new covenant in my blood." These interpretative elements associated with the instructive words "Do this in remembrance of me," give to the rite a note of great solemnity. One does not find here the sense of joy and gladness but a sense of a rite commanded by Jesus to be perpetuated as a tragic memorial. Christ suffered in his body the pangs of death in order that he might become the means whereby man could find atonement for sin. Even the cup of the new covenant is the cup of blood shed for those who have entered the covenant of the Church. The closing words of the rite as Paul received it, "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes," also indicate a heightening of the sacrificial significance of the rite. Ex-

⁸⁰ I Cor. 11:23-26.

piation of sins and the establishment of a new covenant have almost obliterated the eschatological note found in the churches of the Palestinian world. All that remains of the eschatological feature of the rite is found in the words, "until he comes."

One further comment about Paul's understanding of the significance of the eucharistic rite is in order here. At Corinth certain malpractices had developed in connection with the rite. Members of the Corinthian church came together to eat the meal as though it were a private family affair. Some gorged themselves with food and drink and did not share their food with those who had less. This created factions within their church and destroyed the essential character of the celebration, that of fellowship. To correct this malpractice, Paul reminded the Corinthians that this meal was the Lord's supper and not a meal to satisfy physical appetites. Therefore he not only suggested that the drinking of the cup should be separated from the meal, but he also stated that Christians who ate the bread and drank the cup in an unworthy manner were profaning the body and blood of Christ and would be held accountable at the judgment of God. Significantly, then, Paul believed that the sacred elements had within them a power which could harm men. Hence Paul no longer thought of the rite merely as a symbol representing men's spiritual hopes but as something sacred, the elements of which contained power to destroy those who lacked respect for them.

Interestingly, the Fourth Evangelist has not included a report of the words or of the meaning of the eucharistic rite in his account of Jesus' last meal with the disciples. Instead he alludes to it in connection with Jesus' performance of a mighty work at the time of the celebration of a Jewish Passover (Jn. 6:52-58). Explicitly he refers to the rite in the context of a discourse on the theme, "I am the bread of life." In this discourse Jesus contrasts the living bread which he offers to his followers with the manna from heaven which temporarily sustained the Israelites in the desert. The new meal of participation in him therefore replaces the old Passover. Details in the narrative of the Feeding of the Multitude by the multiplication of the loaves as told by the Fourth Evangelist indicate that he intended the event itself also to refer indirectly to the eucharistic meal.

The crowds followed Jesus because mighty works previously performed by him had convinced them of his messianic mission. Upon witnessing the great sign of the miraculous feeding, they now wanted to make him their messianic king. He had the Messiah's power to provide lavishly for them from meager resources and could, therefore, be the one who was able to usher in the golden age of plenty. This was a mistake; the crowds did not understand the significance of the miraculous meal, the character of the one who had provided for their needs, or what he had to offer them as their Messiah. They had sought him because they had been given their fill of the loaves and were, as a consequence, satisfied with food which perishes; they longed only for things of a perishing world. Their fathers had been likewise satisfied in the desert with manna from heaven. As the fathers had died in the wilderness, so also would the descendants, who wanted mere physical sustenance. In contrast to this perishable food, Jesus could give them food coming down from heaven which, if eaten, had the power to give them eternal life. He could give this bread because he himself was the living bread, sent by God from heaven and stamped with his seal.⁸¹

The evangelist concludes the discourse with these words:

So Jesus said to them, "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you have no life in you; he who eats [or chews] my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is food indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him."⁸²

The evangelist's reference to Jesus' giving his life to make atonement for sins as the great saving medium is unusual, for he generally refers to salvation as effected through Christ's exaltation, his

⁸¹ The seal mentioned in John 6:27 can be interpreted in two different ways. It may mean that God has certified Jesus as the accredited distributor of the bread. The interpretation does scant justice to the context, where the Son and the bread are more closely related. In the catacomb frescoes the bread as used by the Christian community is shown with a cross cut in its surface. This suggests that the seal refers to Christ who is himself the bread.

⁸² Jn. 6:53-56.

return to the Father, or his being lifted up and hence drawing all men to him. It is even more surprising that the evangelist declares that the bread, Christ's body, must be eaten and his blood drunk if men are to have eternal life. Only a strongly intrenched tradition about the meaning of the Christian rite can explain this departure. It must be assumed, therefore, that the tradition inherited by this evangelist made the eucharist the re-enactment of the death of Christ and made participation in the sacrifice of that death the basis of its effectiveness. Hence, to be saved, man must eat the flesh, which is really flesh and was given for the life of the world. The tradition presupposed here is the one we have already met in the writings of Paul. But the Fourth Evangelist goes beyond Paul, both in the crass language that he uses to refer to the eucharistic eating and in his conception of mystical participation in the being of Christ as the way of salvation.

Whether the documents of the New Testament provide evidence of the liturgical materials used in the celebration of the eucharist depends upon the analysis of certain key passages. It has been suggested that in Revelation 4 and 5, particularly in its lyrics, there may be evidence for such an early eucharistic service. The introduction to the entire passage is provided by the words, "Behold, I stand at the door and knock, if any one hears my voice and opens the door, I will come in to him and eat with him and he with me" (Rev. 3:20).³³ When the door of heaven is opened, what we see is the vision of God enthroned with the Lamb at his side. In praise of the Lamb, the saints sing a new song:

Worthy art thou to take the scroll and to open its seals,
for thou wast slain and by thy blood didst ransom man for God
from every tribe and tongue and people and nation,
and hast made them a kingdom and priests to our God,
and they shall reign on earth.³⁴

This is followed by other lyric utterances that speak of the slain Lamb, who now sits on the throne beside God, as worthy to receive

³³ The suggestion that one source of inspiration for the seer's vision is the Christian eucharist is to be found in my article "Revelation 4-5 and Early Christian Liturgical Usage," *JBL*, LXXI (1952), 75-84.

³⁴ Rev. 5:11.

blessing, honor, might, and glory forever. The liturgical action closes with a choral Amen. It may well be that certain groups of Christians celebrated their sacred meal as the anticipation of a messianic banquet in heaven and that the Seer of Revelation borrowed elements of their liturgical usage to describe the worship of the saints before the enthroned Lamb. The hymn in Philippians 2:6-11 to the glorified Servant is similarly appropriate for a eucharistic service of worship. Here Christ is praised as the one who, though he was of the divine and eternal order, came to earth as a servant, took on the form of a man, and suffered the humiliation of death upon the cross. For this atoning work, he was exalted by God to receive the title "Lord," that at the sound of this name every knee should bow.

Our discussion of the eucharistic rite and of the liturgical materials appropriate for it shows how different were the interpretations of the meal emerging in the early Church. In its celebration of the rite, the Palestinian church expressed the hope of imminent reunion with their Messiah while the Hellenistic church stressed the ideas of atonement made for men's sins by their Lord Jesus Christ and the creation of a new covenant. The Palestinian church regarded the rite as a symbolic enactment prefiguring the heavenly messianic banquet while the Hellenistic church made the rite a sacrament and declared that participation in the rite itself was the means whereby God conferred his grace upon the worshiper. Among Hellenistic Christians, the author of the Fourth Gospel went further in the direction of sacramentalism than Paul had. But he still carried on Paul's idea of the rite as one that celebrates the atoning value of Christ's death and the creation of a newly covenanted people.

The direction in which the thought of the Hellenistic church moved as it reinterpreted the rite of baptism and of the common meal is one that is foreign to the Jewish tradition. The direction is that of sacramentalism, and sacramentalism, which implies that a rite is efficacious by virtue of its very performance, played no part in the religious thought of the Jewish people. For its rites were efficacious because God had enjoined their performance. It is to the context of the mystery cults that one has to go for other examples of rites sacramentally interpreted. The extent to which the Hellenis-

tic church may be said to have reinterpreted its traditional rites after the fashion of pagan cults is therefore a measure of the difference between it and the Qumran Sect.

In the case of the Palestinian church the situation is quite different. Here three elements of similarity between Christian and Sectarian ritual usage are to be noted. The first is the nature of the rites themselves, an initiatory rite and a common meal. The second is the interpretation of the rites as occasions for the heightening and experience of the eschatological expectations. The third is the common tendency to regard the ritual acts as symbolic, a tendency which in Christian circles provided the basis for the development of the sacramental interpretation. Even so, there are important differences. The Qumran community never went beyond the ideas of initiation and purification in its understanding of the water rite and gave no special importance to the person of the Messiah in its observance of the common meal. For the Christian communities of Palestine, however, the person of Christ was from the outset intimately associated with both ritual acts. He had given the example of submission to baptism and had made the common meal a significant occasion. He was responsible for the coming of the Spirit in connection with the initiatory rite, and reunion with him in the Kingdom of God was what the Christians looked forward to and anticipated in their perpetuation of the common meal.

What we find here, as in the areas of comparison considered in the earlier chapters of this study, is a state of affairs that permits no simple conclusions about relationships between the Christian and the Qumran groups. Analogies in origins, thought, and observance can be seen to have existed. These analogies suggest connections that must at one time also have existed, and this is not surprising. After all, contemporary movements powerful enough to have succeeded in separating out and holding the loyalties of elements of a religious community as strongly cohesive as the Jewish people must have been comparably attractive. And movements as strongly eschatological as were those of Qumran and of the early Church can scarcely be thought to have failed to share their enthusiasms and their hopes. They had too much in common. But the how and when of the connections still escape us, and this also is not surprising. Com-

munities such as that of Qumran and of the early Church can legitimately be expected to have handed on information about their origin and history, the Church more so than the Dead Sea community. They may also be expected to have transmitted information concerning those with whom they stood in conflict. But they can scarcely be expected to have preserved reminiscences about their relations to those with whom they were in some kind of agreement. This is contrary to the self-interest of community tradition. Hence it is unlikely that, in connection with the how and when of Qumran-Christian relations, we shall ever get beyond an eventual consensus of scholarly opinion, which means, in effect, a probability judgment based upon the study of the general and the particular.

For the broader aspects of such a judgment, the essential features of the two communities that have brought themselves to our attention repeatedly in this study may well be regarded as significant. The Qumran Sect reflects in its origins a profound respect for the marvel of God's choice of Israel and is in essence a community that attempted by a combination of self-humiliation and perfect obedience to be worthy of the divine election and thus of the promises of the inherited tradition. The early Church had a much more personal and individual origin. It was brought into being by a person to whom the covenant was the symbol of an inclusive divine-human relationship and who made his association with his people and his followers express the constructive nature of that relationship. His person, therefore, tends to be involved in every aspect of the life and thought of the community that properly has come to bear the name by which it confessed him.

Index to Passages Cited

OLD TESTAMENT

Genesis
7:1 104
16:16 112
21:2 112
21:9 112
21:10-12 112

Exodus
18:21-22 64
33:19 122

Leviticus
4:3 163
5:16 163
6:22 163
19 196
23 214

Numbers
3:5-9 63 n.
16-18 63
18:6-7 63 n.
21:17 98
21:18 98, 116 n.
24:17-19 117

Deuteronomy
5:21 48
9:4-5 49
9:10 59
16:1-17 214
17:9 63 n.

17:18 63 n.
18:15-16 73
19:1 63 n.
21:1-9 101 n.
27 218
30:11-14 10

I Samuel
28:6 64

Psalms
1:3-4 41
16:8-11 127, 165
19 210, 213
110:1 127

Proverbs
15:8 220

Isaiah
7:14 111
9:5-7 155
11:2 156
24:17 116
28:14-18 124
28:16 121
29:11 123
40:3 39, 175
48:8 120
49:6-7 47
52:5 121
52:13-53:12 88

53:7-8 127
54:1 112
57:10 47
61:1 19
64:4 123
65:2 121
65:17 123

Jeremiah
9:24 123
25:11 108

Ezekiel
34:24 156
38 12
39 12
40-48 163
44-46 163
44:4-16 63 n.
44:15 116, 221
47:8 44
47:12 44

Daniel
7:13 20
7:22 120 n.
7:25 208
9 109
9:20-27 108
9:27 135
11:31 135
12:11 135

INDEX

Hosea		Amos		1:12-2:4 114
2:23	123	5:14	174	2:4 28, 84
3:4	117 n.	5:26-27	99, 116 n.	Zechariah
4:16	115	Habakkuk		4:14 163
Joel		1:2-11	113	14:3-5 12
2:28	20	1:5	121	Malachi
2:28-32	119	1:6-9	97	1:10 116
APOCRYPHA				
I Maccabees				
4:46	72			
9:27	72			
PSEUDEPIGRAPHA				
Enoch		61:5	89	8:19 44, 220
1	45	62:14	90	14:10 216
4:17	210	62:15	90	15:1-34 216
12:1-4	45	69:27	89	16:10-18:19 215
12:12-14	45	70-71	89	19:23-25 45
28	44	71:14-16	90	22:1-24 216
37-71	83, 120 n.	71:17	91	23:26 176
39:6-7	89	72-82	209, 210	32:4-9 215
45:3-4	89	85-90	130	34:12-19 215
46:1	89	Jubilees		37:20 179
46:3	89	1:1-25	217	44:3-4 216
48:3	89	1:5	217	50:4 175
48:7	90	1:26-27	220	Testament of Levi
49:1-2	33	2:22	221	2:10-11 158
49:2	89	4:26	44	8:1-17 160
49:3	89, 90	5:17-18	215	17:2 158
51:3	89	6:19	217	18 158
53:7	90	6:21-22	216	18:2-14 160
55:4	89	6:37	209	
55:63	89	QUMRAN		
Damascus Document		1:13-2:1	96, 115	6:2-11 99
1:4	49	4:2-4	221	6:3-11 116 n.
1:5-12	80	4:13-19	116	6:11 80

INDEX

6:12-14	116	2:15-16	50	9:13-14	222
7:12-20	99	2:19-26	47	10:1-9	212, 214
7:20-21	81	2:20-26	65 n.	10:8	221
7:21	116 n.	3:6-9	65	10:10	47
8:21	82	3:13-4:26	147	11:1-10	48
9:2	33	4:2-3	65 n.	11:13-15	48
11:19-21	220	5:3-5	52		
14:6-20	116 n.	5:25-6:1	177		
19:1	34	6:1	33		
20:1	80, 82	6:4-6	223		
20:1-2(Ms. B)	48	6:8-9	65 n.		
20:15(Ms. B)	176	6:8-13	94		
20:16-18(Ms. B)	117 n.	6:25	67 n.		
20:27-34	14	7:10-12	94		
		8:1	65		
		8:4-10	41, 44		
		8:5-9	65		
		8:5-10	124		
		8:11-12	94		
		8:14-16	39, 44		
		8:16-19	177		
		8:20-9:25	176		
		9:7-8	65 n.		
		9:8-11	73, 156		

Manual of Discipline

1:1-15	178
1:1-20	177
1:1-3:18	217
1:11-15	208
1:21-2:4	65 n.
1:22-2:1	49
1:24-2:1	218

Habakkuk Commentary

2:1-10	121
2:11-3:14	97
7:1-6	80
8:1-3	81, 123
10:6-13	98
11	82
11:3-8	208
12:13-13:4	115

Thanksgiving Psalms

4	109
7	109

War Scroll

18:10-14	40
----------	----

NEW TESTAMENT AND EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

	Matthew	6:25-33	32 n.	18:15-17	33
	1:1-17	7:1	32 n.	18:17	58
	1:20-23	7:21-23	32	19:12	33
	3:10	8:5-13	56	19:17	34
	3:13-17	10	185	19:28	120 n., 139
	3:14-15	10:29	150	21:32	34, 181
	5-7	11:7-15	144	24-25	185
	5:14	12:9-14	32 n.	25:31-34	142
	5:17-20	12:27	87	25:31-46	139
	5:17-48	12:28	87	26:6	124 n.
	5:20	13	185	28:19-20	185
	5:33-34	15:21-28	56		
	5:43	16:18	58		
	5:45	18	185		

Mark

1:1	166
1:9-11	165

INDEX

1:10 238
 4:35-41 166
 6:30-44 166
 6:45-52 166
 7:24-30 56
 9:1 137
 9:2-8 166
 9:11-13 119
 9:13 87
 10:1-9 194
 10:18 85
 10:47 165
 12:37 56
 13 24, 74, 134
 13:7-8 134
 13:9-10 134 n.
 13:14-20 134
 13:24-25 135
 13:26-27 135
 13:32 134 n., 143
 14:22-25 239
 14:58 124 n.

Luke

1:16-17 164
 1:46-55 164
 2:10 167
 11:20 19, 87
 12:22-32 188 n.
 16:16 144
 17:3-4 33
 17:7-10 55, 188 n.
 18:31-34 127
 22:17-19 240
 22:25-27 167
 24:26 167

John

1:1-5 229
 1:1-16 169
 1:5 30, 150, 171

1:10-11 229
 1:13 237
 1:14 229
 1:16 229
 1:21 74
 2:19 124
 2:19-21 228
 3 236
 3:5-9 171
 3:16 29
 3:17-21 142, 152
 3:31 172
 5-12 233
 6:14 74
 6:27 243
 6:52-58 242
 6:53-56 243
 6:54 141
 8:44-45 172
 9:5 172
 10:11-18 142
 13:34 30
 14:6 172
 16:13 191
 16:33 141
 17 30
 17:1-5 231
 17:3 191
 17:4 231
 17:6-19 231
 17:14 172
 17:20-26 231
 19:30 231

Acts

1:5 235
 2:14-36 127
 2:16-17 235
 2:17-21 119
 2:23 127

2:27 165
 2:28 235
 2:33 231
 2:36 165
 2:42 227
 2:44-45 67 n.
 2:46 183, 227, 239
 2:46-47 240
 3:21 136
 3:22 86 n.
 3:22-26 74
 4:7 183
 4:11 124
 4:12 136, 139
 4:25-26 127
 4:32 183
 4:34-37 67 n.
 5:4 67 n.
 5:31 127
 6:1 21
 6:6 71
 6:7 63
 7:38 59
 8:1 58
 8:9 58
 8:12-24 235
 9:17 235
 9:31 58
 10:44-48 235
 10:45 127
 11:27 72
 13:1 72
 13:30-33 165
 13:33-37 127
 13:38-39 127
 13:38-44 121
 15 56
 15:5 63
 15:9 235
 16:31-33 235

INDEX

Romans	
1:15	122
1:16	56
1:17	28
2:24	121
3:10	186 f.
3:21-22	34
3:24-25	168
5:6-8	187
6-8	27
6:1-4	235
6:3-8	168
6:17	28
7:5	186
7:9	186
7:17	27
7:18-24	186
7:24	28
7:25	28
8:18-22	151
8:18-39	151
8:29-30	151
8:31-39	138
9-11	111
9:1-13	122
9:4-5	121
9:25	123
9:31-10:4	124
9:32-10:4	121
10:21	121
11:17-20	41

I Corinthians

1:17-31	123
1:23	171
1:31	123
2:9	123
3:10-16	124 n., 228
5:6-8	230
9:2	70, 183

11:23-26	241
11:26	138
12-14	73
12:28	72
13:1-3	189
13:4-13	190
15:3-4	126
15:8	187
15:8-10	70
15:20-28	151

II Corinthians

1:5	70
4:6	187
5:16	70
6:2	120
6:19	124 n., 228

Galatians

1:16	187
1:20	187
2	56
2:12	184
4:10	184
4:21-30	112, 122
5:3	186
5:6	188
5:18-23	189
6:12	184

Ephesians

2:19-22	124 n.
5:14	239

Philippians

1:1	77
2:5-11	168
2:6-11	229, 245
2:9	168
3:12	187

Colossians

1:15-20	168
2:12	168

I Thessalonians

4:13-18	137
4:17	240

Hebrews

4:14	165
------	-----

James

5:12	33
------	----

I Peter

2:3-10	124
2:4-10	121, 124
2:10	123

Revelation

1:1-2	74
3:20	26, 244
4	244
5	244
5:9-10	229
5:11	244
6:11	26
7:2-8	26
7:7-12	151
7:17	26
14:4	26
14:5	26
14:12	26
15:3	26
16:15	26
17:13-14	27, 140
19:7-8	229
19:11	27
20:6	26
21:12-14	26

Didache

8:1	233
9:4	239
11	72

General Index

- Aaronic benediction, 219
- Aaronic priesthood, 206, 207
- Ablutions, 222
- Abomination of desolation, 135, 136
- Abraham, 122, 181
- Acts of devotion
 - Christian, 226–46
 - Old Testament, 214
 - Palestinian community, 227–28
 - Qumran, 206–26
- Admission of members, 64, 69
- Albright, W. F., 29 n.
- ‘am ha-areš*, 54, 56
- AMN, 213
- Ancestry, claims for, 21, 45
- Apocalyptic, 12, 24, 110, 117
- Apostles, 66
- Archaism, 176
- Arndt, W. F., 28 n.
- Avi-Yonah, M., 132 n.
- Bacon, Benjamin W., 31, 233 n.
- Baptism, 137, 185, 234–38, 239
- Barnett, R. D., 79 n.
- Bible study; *see* Interpretation
- Bishops, 77
- Blessings, 219, 224
- Boasting, 123
- Bowman, John, 207 n.
- Brotherhood, 179
- Brown, R. E., 29 n., 30
- Brownlee, W. H., 8 n., 47 n., 102 n., 107, 113 n.
- Bultmann, R., 28 n., 86
- Burch, V., 28 n.
- Burrows, Millar, 1, 2, 3, 4, 8 n., 9 n., 27 n., 28 n., 40 n., 41 n., 46 n., 47 n., 50 n., 51, 52 n., 53 n., 78 n., 79 n., 82 n., 84 n., 97 n., 114 n., 117 n., 132 n., 148 n., 157 n., 162 n., 207 n., 208 n., 209 n., 213 n., 216 n., 219 n., 223 n.
- Cadbury, H. J., 79 n., 86 n.
- Calendar, 30, 205, 207–14, 228, 229–33, 234
- Ceremonial laws, 178, 184, 193
- Ceremonies, 217, 234–46
- Charismatic leadership, 70, 71
- Charles, R. H., 89
- Christology, 111, 119, 164–67, 168, 168–72
- Church (*ekklesia*; *kahal*), definition of, 58
- Circumcision, 46
- Commentaries on Scriptures, 113, 115
 - see also* Interpretation
- Communal meals, 222–24
- Constitutive principles of communities, 38–51, 52–59, 60
- Cornerstone, 124

- Covenant significance, 43
 Cross, F. M., 2 n., 8 n., 10 n., 64 n.,
 77 n., 78 n., 114 n., 207 n.,
 219 n., 223 n., 224 n.
 Cullmann, Oscar, 68 n., 164 n.
 Cult; *see* Acts of devotion
- Damascus Document, 13, 35, 115,
 117, 130, 208, 209, 216 n.
 Danby, H., 100 n.
 Daniel, Book of, 108
 Davies, W. D., 28 n., 50 n., 148 n.
 Determinism, 149
 Didache, 25, 75
 Disciples, Jesus', 57
 see also The Twelve
 Discipline at Qumran, 177
 Discovery of scrolls, 1
 Divorce, 194, 199
 Doberstein, J. W., 2 n., 130 n.
 Dodd, C. H., 29 n., 118 n., 120 n.
 Dreams, 64
 Dualism, 28, 29, 30, 80, 146-48,
 150, 151, 171, 172, 179
 Dupont-Sommer, A., 2, 3, 4, 50,
 78 n., 79, 82, 103, 104 n., 107,
 213 n.
- Early Church
 and Judaism, 37, 118, 120-22,
 124-25, 126, 127, 142, 227,
 228
 and Qumran; *see* Qumran and
 Early Church; *see also* spe-
 cial topics
Ekklesia; *see* Church
 Elect, the, 114, 120, 136, 239
 Election, 45, 48, 49, 52, 150, 151,
 152
 Elijah, 87
- Elliger, K., 107 n.
 Enoch, Book of, 147
 Esau, 178
 Eschatology, 118-20, 129-33, 134-
 44, 152-54, 201, 224, 239, 242,
 246
 Ethics, 178-80, 186-90, 192-202
 Eucharist, 239-44
 Evil, 146-49, 151
 Exclusivism-Universalism, 29, 56,
 59, 76, 167, 180, 183, 193, 202
- Fasting, 233
 Festivals, 46, 214-16, 228-34
 see also Calendar
 Fire on altar, 116
 Forty years, 131, 175, 176
 Foundation, 124
 Founders, 75, 78-92
 Fourth Evangelist; *see* Fourth Gos-
 pel
 Fourth Gospel, 28, 29, 30, 31, 85,
 236-37, 242-44
 Freedman, David Noel, 5
 Freedom, 188, 199
- Gaster, T. H., 4, 8 n., 9 n., 146 n.,
 149 n.
 Gingrich, F. W., 28 n.
 Ginsberg, H. L., 102 n.
 Gnosis, 232
 Gnostics, 36, 51, 52
 Goudoever, J. van, 205 n., 209 n.,
 215 n., 229 n., 230 n.
 Greatest commandment, 195
 Groussouw, W., 28 n.
- Habakkuk Commentary, 102, 103,
 108, 109, 113, 114, 115
 Harris, R., 28 n.

- Hasidim* (the Pious), 175, 207
 Hatred, 180
 Hebrews, Book of, 111
 Hellenism, 50, 208
 Hellenistic community, 68, 69, 197, 200, 202, 227, 239, 240–44, 245
 Hellenists; *see* Hellenistic community
 Hemerobaptists, 36
 Hermeneutical principles; *see* Interpretation
 Hillel's Seven Rules, 102
 Holy of Holies, 44
 Holy house, 221
 Holy war, 132
 Hyatt, Philip, 5
 Hymns, 229
- Identity of Qumran community, 1, 8
 Initiation, 49, 79, 177, 217, 218, 237
 see also Admission
 Interpretation, methods of:
 allegorical, 103–6, 107, 112
 Daniel's, Book of, 108
 fulfilment, 11, 95, 96–99, 102–3, 106–7, 109–10, 110–13, 114, 128, 175, 176, 220, 221, 230
 Jesus', 195
 Philo's, 103–6
 Rabbis', 100–102, 103, 112
 Interpreters of lies, 109
 see also Man of lies
 Iranian dualism, 146
 Ishmael, Rabbi, Thirteen Rules of, 102
- J document, 7
 Jaubert, A., 207 n.
- James, 69
 James, Book of, 25
 Jamnia, 110
 Jesus, Jesus Christ
 and *'am ha-areš*, 54, 56
 ancestry, 21
 and apostles, 70
 baptism of, 238
 belief in, 235
 as center of worship, 228
 coming of, 152
 death and resurrection, 20, 58, 59, 87, 189, 204, 229, 235, 245
 ethical teaching of, 86, 191–203
 and Eucharist, 240–44
 as founder of community, 85–91
 in Fourth Gospel, 169–72
 as hope, 139, 141
 and John the Baptist, 34
 and Judaism, 122, 192–96, 200–201
 and the Law, 184, 233
 as Messiah, 58, 66, 79, 85, 118, 119, 121, 165, 239
 miracles, 21
 mission, 183
 new Law, 34
 and Nicodemus, 236
 and Old Testament, 93
 as paschal lamb, 230
 in Pauline epistles, 126, 128, 167–69, 187
 personal relation to, 60, 138, 247
 and prayer, 231
 as prophet, 86
 and Qumran, 32, 192
 as revealer, 74
 sayings of, 32, 33, 34, 150
 self-understanding, 86–88

- social milieu of, 54
in Synoptics, 19, 85, 167
as teacher, 34, 75
and Teacher of Righteousness,
2, 18, 75, 83, 91
teaching of, 54, 55, 143-44, 154,
187, 188, 190, 191-203
and the Temple, 220
and the Twelve, 20, 77; *see also*
Disciples
universalism, 29
in wilderness, 38
see also Son of David; Son of
God; Son of Man
Jewish Christianity; *see* Palestinian
Christianity
Jewish heritage; *see* Old Testament
John, Gospel of; *see* Fourth Gospel
John the Baptist, 86, 87, 119, 133,
144, 163-64, 167, 175, 180-82,
185, 200, 231-32, 233, 237, 238
Johnson, Sherman, 5, 28 n., 66 n.
Jones, G. V., 165 n.
Josephus, 8, 38, 72, 135, 222, 238
Jubilees, 147, 175, 209, 210, 214,
215, 217, 220, 225
Judah and Levi, 162
Judgment, 117, 121, 142
Justification by faith, 187, 188
- Kahal*; *see* Church
King, W. L., 6 n.
Kingdom of God, 67, 87, 92, 131,
143, 201, 240, 246
Kittim, 114, 115, 130
Kiyyun, 116
Klausner, J., 79 n., 220 n.
Know, J., 164 n.
Kraeling, C. H., 62 n., 87 n., 164 n.,
238 n.
- Kuhn, Karl G., 4, 5 n., 28 n., 29 n.,
158
- LaSor, W. S., 158 n.
Law, 14, 193, 194, 196, 197-98,
201, 203, 207, 208, 210, 217,
220, 222, 231, 236
see also Jesus and Law; Old
Testament
Leach, E. R., 207 n.
Leadership, 70, 71, 76, 77
Levi; *see* Levites
Levites, 116, 130, 158, 159, 160,
217, 218, 221
Levitical priesthood; *see* Levites
Lietzmann, Hans, 229 n.
Liver, J., 157 n., 158 n.
- Maccabees, 206
Man of Lies, 130; *see also* Inter-
preters of lies
"Man of Scorn," 115; *see also* In-
terpreters of lies; Man of lies
Manson, Wm., 88 n.
Manual of Discipline, 13, 25
Matthew, Book of, 31-34, 35, 110,
185
Membership, 61-63
Messiah(s), 65, 66, 73, 79, 83, 86,
91, 117, 118, 121, 128, 144,
155, 156, 157, 162-63, 164,
164-68, 171, 223, 224, 228,
239, 240, 243, 245
Messianic meal, 67
see also Eucharist
Milik, J., 216 n.
Mishnah, 100
Mithras, 232
Moore, G. F., 54 n., 89
Moral responsibility; *see* Ethics

- Morality; *see* Ethics
Morgenstern, J., 207 n.
Moses, 38, 39, 42, 44, 45, 49, 63, 64, 68, 73, 74, 86 n., 96 n., 106, 125, 126, 166, 167, 175, 184, 185, 194, 195, 209, 215, 217, 218, 220, 231
Mowinckel, Sigmund, 156 n.
Mowry, Lucetta, 29 n.
Murphy, R. E., 28 n.
- Nature, Gnostic view of, 50
New law, 34, 184–85, 200
New Testament, 17, 18–24, 27
New Testament and Qumran parallels; *see* Qumran and early Church
North, R., 8 n.
- Oaths, 33, 199
Obermann, J., 207 n., 208 n.
Observantists, 194, 195, 196 n., 197, 198, 199
Old Testament, 7, 9, 11, 80, 113–18, 118–28, 129, 174, 182, 183, 187, 192, 205, 214, 215, 226, 228, 234, 245
see also Interpretation
Order in cosmos, 210, 213, 214
- Palestinian Christianity, 165, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 197, 202, 227, 239, 240, 241, 245
Passover, 229, 230, 233
Paul, 23, 69, 70, 73, 85, 111, 112, 121, 123, 124 n., 126, 127, 136, 137, 138, 139, 151, 165, 167, 168, 170, 183, 186, 187, 188, 189, 191, 202, 229, 230, 232, 235, 236, 239, 240, 241, 242
- Pella, 69
Pentecost, 21, 111, 119, 230–33
Pentecostal experiences; *see* Pentecost
Periodization, 129–30, 135, 136, 143, 167, 235
Personification, 150
I Peter, Epistle of, 111
Pfeiffer, R. H., 114 n.
Pharisees, 9, 10, 63, 110, 175, 177, 192, 194, 237
Philo, 8, 38, 99, 104, 106, 112
Planting as traditional metaphor, 40, 43, 89
Pliny, 8, 38, 229
Ploeg, J. van der, 9 n., 132 n.
Poor, the, 114, 117, 163
Potter, Charles, 2 n.
Prayer, 221
Present age, 131, 133
Priesthood; *see* Priests
Priests, 63, 64, 65, 94, 116, 206, 217, 218, 221
Prophet, the, 74, 86
Prophets, 72, 73, 74, 80, 95
Pseudepigraphical works at Qumran, 12
Purification at Qumran, 151
- Qumran and Christianity; *see* Qumran and early Church
Qumran community, 1, 7–9, 17 n., 31, 37, 40, 62, 107, 176
see also special topics as Identity; Initiation; etc.
Qumran and early Church, 2–6, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 36, 38, 53, 62, 66, 67, 76, 77, 78–92, 79, 112, 121, 123, 124, 128, 134, 136, 138, 143, 153, 172,

- 183, 188, 195, 196, 201, 203,
228, 230, 231, 234, 237, 238,
246
see also special topics as Found-
ers; Structure; etc.
- Qumran and Gnosticism, 51
Qumran and Hellenists, 68, 69
Qumran and Judaism, 113-17
Quotation, method of scripture, 96
n.
- Rabin, Chaim, 96
Rabinowitz, I., 103
Reicke, Bo, 5
Remnant, 46, 49
Resurrection of Jesus, 20, 58, 126,
187, 188, 235
Revealer, 232
Revelation, Book of, 24-27
Righteousness, 34
 higher, 181, 184
Roberts, Bleddyn, 103
Roth, C., 118
Rowley, E. M., 50 n.
- Sabbath, 193, 194, 219, 228, 233
Sacraments, 234-46
Sacrifices, 219-22
Sadducees, 110
Salvation as theme, 6
Schubert, K., 2 n., 34 n., 130 n.,
132 n., 148 n., 158 n., 208 n.
- Scripture; *see* Interpretation; New
 Testament; Old Testament
Secret traditions, 45, 50, 107, 210
Sectaries; *see* Qumran
Secularism, 174
Segal, J. B., 207 n.
Segal, M. H., 103 n.
- Self-interpretation, 53, 59, 65, 114-
 16
Separation, 44, 206
 see also Purification; Withdrawal
Seventy Years, 108
Sikkuth, 116
Silbermann, L. H., 158
Smith, Morton, 157 n.
- Sociological aspects of communi-
 ties, 61-63, 94
Son of David, 165, 185
Son of God, 142, 166, 231, 232
Son of Man, 20, 85, 89, 91, 119, 20
 n., 135, 136, 137, 139, 164, 166,
 167, 168
Sonne, I., 46 n.
- Sovereignty of God, 144-50, 152
Spirit, 67, 136, 152, 189, 190, 191,
 200, 203, 232, 234, 235, 238,
 239
Staff, 116
Stendahl, Krister, 3, 4, 5, 28, 31,
 96 n., 102 n., 113 n., 148 n.
- Stephen's speech, 120
Stern, S. N., 103 n.
- Stoics, 76
Structure of communities, 65-75,
 94, 95, 131, 217, 222
Suffering Servant, 46, 88, 127, 131,
 164, 168, 229
- Taylor, V., 164 n.
- Teacher of Righteousness, 18, 19,
 43, 50, 75, 78, 78-85, 93, 94,
 108, 109, 114, 115, 117, 122,
 130, 131, 157, 176, 203, 208
 and Jesus, 2, 81-83, 91
 possibility of resurrection, 81-83
Teachers in communities, 75
Teicher, J. L., 8 n., 46 n.

INDEX

- Temple, 67, 69, 134, 168, 205, 206, 208, 219, 220, 221, 222, 225, 227, 228
- Testimonies, 113
- Thanksgiving, Psalms of, 14, 84, 109, 145, 149
- Themes of Old Testament, 113–18
- Thousands, hundreds, fifties, tens, 64
- Triumph as motif at Qumran, 40
- True Israel, 118, 120–22
- Twelve, the, 57, 66, 70, 72, 77
- Universalism; *see* Exclusivism-Universalism
- Vaux, R. de, 8 n., 17
- Vergil, 167
- War scroll (The War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness), 12, 117
- Wicked Priest, 19, 43, 81, 83, 109, 114, 208, 220, 221
- Wilderness, 38, 39, 47
- Wilson, Edmund, 2, 3
- Withdrawal, 39, 52, 181, 192, 193
see also Purification, Separation
- Word, 170
- “X” in Isaiah scroll, 46
- Yadin, Y., 9 n.
- Young, F., 74
- Zadokites, 63, 64, 116, 130, 157, 207, 221, 222